

YU. KASHLEV

After 14.000 Wars



YU KASHLEV

After 14,000 Wars



Progress Publishers

Moscow

Translated from the Russian by *David Sinclair-Loutit*
Designed by *Yevgeni Permyakov*

Ю. Кашлев

ПОСЛЕ 14000 ВОЙН

(О внешней политике СССР, проблемах
мирного сосуществования и борьбе идеологии
на современном этапе)

На английском языке

First printing 1979

© Издательство «Молодая гвардия» 1976

English translation © Progress Publishers 1979

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

К $\frac{11101-177}{014(01)-79}$ 75—79 0801000000

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Author's Introduction</i>	7
I	
<i>History Reviewed</i>	11
The Course Laid Out by Lenin	12
Through the Ice-Floes of the Cold War	17
The Main Trend	25
II	
<i>The Peace Programme in Action</i>	29
To Eliminate the Hotbeds of War!	33
For a Radical Turn Towards Detente and Peace in Europe	40
The Historic Helsinki Conference	52
The USSR and the USA; From Confrontation to Co-operation	66
III	
<i>The 25th Congress of the CPSU: For Disarmament and Detente</i>	81
Socialism and Peace Are Inseparable	81
A Task of the First Priority	86
Implementing the Helsinki Agreements	111
The Belgrade Meeting and Human Aspirations	118
For the Sake of Peace and Freedom	123
IV	
<i>Detente: Who Profits and Who Loses from It?</i>	131
"I Want to Be Alive"	131
In the Interests of All Nations	136

An Instrument of Co-operation	142
The Enemies of Detente	148

V

<i>Peaceful Coexistence and the Struggle Between Ideologies</i>	161
"Ideologisation" or "Deideologisation"?	161
Today's Urgent Problems	166
True and False Defenders of Democracy	170
The Right to Know: Who Is Better Informed?	182
The Struggle for the Minds and Souls of the Young	197
<i>Conclusion</i>	209

Mankind has fought over 14,000 large and small wars. These have carried away nearly 4,000,000,000 human lives—that is to say about the same number as there are people living in the world today.

The Soviet Union suffered the greatest losses during the Second World War: the nazis destroyed 1,710 towns, burnt 72,000 villages, and razed 32,000 factories.

Since 1945 the world has spent 6,000,000,000,000 dollars on arms—that is to say about the total gross product of all the world's countries in 1976. Over half this sum was spent by the United States of America alone.

Since 1945 the USSR has made a total of about 70 important proposals on the questions of disarmament and consolidating international security.

AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION

Over the last few years I have taken part in several very interesting and very different international conferences and meetings—in Moscow, Paris, Nairobi, Belgrade, and elsewhere. All of these left me with the impression that international relations, especially between the socialist and the capitalist countries, have entered a new stage, that times have truly changed since the days of open confrontation and the cold war.

In this respect I find particularly memorable the two years I spent in Geneva where I was taking part in the drawing up of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. The external appearance of that cosy Swiss town which fits like a horseshoe on the shore of Lake Geneva provided a sharp contrast to what was going on in the town's numerous conference halls: in these passions were boiling and diplomats arguing; besides the preparatory meetings for the European Conference, the Soviet-American Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, sittings of the UN Committee on Disarmament, and many other conferences and meetings were all taking place there simultaneously. Documents were being drawn up at all these that would influence the course of events far beyond Switzerland's frontiers and even far beyond Europe's.

While all being interesting and important in themselves, all these negotiations taken together provided a picture of a dynamic international political life resembling a vast building site where decrepit houses are being knocked down at the same time as new ones that are to stand for many years to come are being erected. Seeing all this from close up, it was impossible not to be struck by the importance of the about-turn away from the former con-

frontation in international relations towards general co-operation and a better mutual understanding between nations that was then being accomplished. It was an about-turn that the Soviet Union had worked for throughout the 60 years of its existence. Today, too, the country considers the consolidation of peace to be its main foreign policy task.

One of the clearest and most convincing proofs of the Soviet Union's faithfulness to the cause of peace among nations was the passage in October 1977 of the new Constitution of the USSR. I happened at that time to be in Yugoslavia's capital at the meeting of the representatives of the 35 states which took part in the European Conference. Many of the participants in the Belgrade meeting took the opportunity at official sittings to congratulate the Soviet Union on the passage of its Constitution, a document that embodies mankind's dreams of peace and friendship between nations. It not only once again reaffirmed the Soviet Union's unshakable line for peace, security, and mutual understanding between nations, but also—and this most directly concerned the work then being done at the Belgrade meeting—gave force of law to all the main principles of interstate relations contained in the Final Act signed in Helsinki.

Regrettably, however, the Western countries do not wish to take upon themselves any constitutional or international legal obligations to strive for the peace and security of all nations. The arms race continues and there are not infrequent aggravations of tension. Mankind would seem to be at a crossroads from which it can either take the path of detente, security, and co-operation or that of continuing the arms race and at best balancing on the brink of war.

The international situation in the last quarter of the 20th century will depend on what is done and how things are done in this respect. Will it finally be possible to negotiate an end to the arms race and agree to disarm or are various countries going to continue to stockpile weapons

that endanger mankind's very existence? Will it be possible to turn the international detente which has just begun into a truly universal and irreversible process or will the enemies of peace manage to slow it down or even torpedo it? Will mankind find a way to join forces to fight such scourges as hunger, illiteracy, the diseases from which millions and millions of people suffer in the world, and the damage being done to the ecological balance or will all these things be left as a sorry legacy to the 21st century?

These are the kind of problem we have on our agenda today. What I would like to do in this book is to examine the heart of these problems and ways of solving them, to recall certain pertinent facts about modern political life, to describe what I have seen at the international negotiations being held nowadays, my fears in connection with the activities of the enemies of peace and detente, and my faith in the possibility of irreversibly excluding war from the facts of human life.

I

HISTORY REVIEWED

The 1970s began under the sign of what came to be called in the West the "Soviet peace offensive" which is considered to have started with the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the spring of 1971. The immense and truly historic significance of the Congress lay in particular in the fact that it correctly, on the basis of a profound scientific analysis of international development trends, defined the moment at which a radical reorganisation of the relations between the socialist and capitalist worlds had become possible and inevitable. The Congress approved a Peace Programme that was unprecedented in depth and scope and at the same time realistic. This Programme constituted an agenda, an action programme for the whole of international life for many years to come.

What is the most important aspect of the colossal change that has come about in the world situation since then? In brief, it is that the principles of the peaceful coexistence of the socialist and capitalist countries have been widely accepted and recognised as the only possible basis for the whole structure of international relations. The historic significance of this change cannot be overestimated: without it the transition from confrontation and cold war to the socialist and capitalist countries' mutually profitable co-operation, the elimination of the most dangerous hotbeds of war on the globe, and the consolidation of the prospects for peace in this and future generations would all have been unthinkable. That all this has become possible is without a doubt due mainly to the socialist countries and to the Soviet Union, to their consistent and peaceful foreign policies whose foundations were laid by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

The Course Laid Out by Lenin

This incident took place a few years ago. A group of foreign tourists was being shown round the study of the founder of the Soviet state in the Kremlin and their attention was caught by one of the objects on Lenin's desk: a bronze statuette of a monkey sitting on a copy of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* and thoughtfully examining a human skull. The guide explained that the statuette had been given to Lenin in 1921 by an American businessman whose name was unfortunately no longer known.

"I can give you some help in this," one of the visitors broke in. "His name was Hammer, Armand Hammer. That's me." And the elderly American recounted the story of how he had been one of the first Western businessmen to visit Moscow, how he had been received by Lenin, and how he had given him that statuette. On doing so, Hammer had said that the statuette in his opinion illustrated Darwin's theory of man's evolution from monkeys. Lenin had disagreed with him and given his own interpretation, saying that the sculptor had wanted to warn mankind about how it might become degraded and return to a primeval state if people did not put an end to wars and start living peacefully with one another.

To live peacefully with one another. . . . With Lenin this was not just words. One of the results of the Great October Socialist Revolution was that it posed a principally new problem: on what basis were the relations between the first workers' and peasants' state and the capitalist world around it to be based? This was a question that Marx and Engels had not elaborated theoretically since they had supposed that the proletarian revolution would be victorious not in one but in several capitalist countries simultaneously. Neither was there any seeking the answer to this question in the annals of the past.

Lenin considered that the main task of Soviet foreign policy at that time was to ensure conditions favourable to the building of socialism in Russia. "The position of

the socialist revolution in Russia," he wrote, "must form the basis of any definition of the international tasks of our Soviet power."* After the 1917 October Revolution, the building of socialism in practice became not only a vital national requirement for Soviet Russia, but also the first socialist state's main internationalist duty to the workers of the world, the main way in which it could help develop the international revolutionary movement. The very fact that it was struggling for peace and for peaceful coexistence with the capitalist countries meant that it had to preserve the gains made by the workers of Russia and of the world—the victorious socialist system—and at the same time help accelerate the world revolutionary process, the social and national liberation of all exploited and oppressed people. Lenin once said that the Bolsheviks had created a completely new set of international relations which would make it possible for all the oppressed nations to throw off the imperialists' yoke. According to Lenin, the Soviet state's foreign policies had to be an important revolutionising factor that would help the cause of socialist revolution. Thus, even then the foundations laid by Lenin to socialist foreign policy contained two main principles: proletarian internationalism and the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems.

Lenin put particular emphasis on the question of war and peace in the complex tangle of foreign political tasks facing the young socialist republic after the October Revolution. "We know, we know only too well," he wrote, "the incredible misfortunes that war brings to the workers and peasants. For that reason our attitude to this question must be most cautious and circumspect."** Never doubting in the victorious advance of socialism around the planet, Lenin decisively rejected in his uncompromising struggle

* V. I. Lenin, "On the History of the Question of the Unfortunate Peace", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 443.

** V. I. Lenin, "Ninth All-Russia Congress of Soviets", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 148.

against leftist adventurism, the "export" of revolution or any violent instigating of it from outside by means of war. Socialism needs no aggressive wars, something alien to its very nature, to come out victorious. On the contrary, it is precisely the struggle for peace which is becoming socialism's main foreign policy task since it is in conditions of peace that it can best prove itself and make fuller use of the advantages over the capitalist system inherent in it for the good of its people and of the world revolutionary movement.

Basing himself on a scientific analysis of these propositions, Lenin came to the conclusion:

- the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems was unavoidable and would be a reality for a long historical period;

- peaceful coexistence was desirable from the point of view of the current and long-term interests of the building of socialism in Russia, of the world revolutionary process, of the working masses and of all peoples fighting for their social and national liberation.

These extremely important conclusions lie at the basis of the foreign policy actions of the CPSU and of the Soviet state to this day.

That the socialist state's first foreign policy document was the Decree on Peace signed by Lenin is well known and also very symbolic. In it Soviet Russia proposed to the warring states that they immediately open negotiations with a view to concluding a just and democratic peace and expressed its resolve to "conclude peace successfully, and at the same time emancipate the labouring and exploited masses of our population from all forms of slavery and all forms of exploitation".*

What was imperialism's answer to this noble call from the socialist state? Blinded by hatred for the Land of Soviets, the West's ruling class was unable then (and for

* V. I. Lenin, "Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 252.

a long time afterwards) to grasp the historical inevitability of peaceful coexistence with the socialist state and adopted aggression as its foreign policy line towards Soviet Russia. It is from those days that Winston Churchill's cynical call for the Bolshevik baby to be smothered in its cradle dates, while US President Woodrow Wilson declared in 1918 that the Allied powers considered Bolshevism the only enemy against which they ought to rally.

The years immediately following the October Revolution saw the armed intervention of 14 capitalist states against Soviet Russia, the economic blockade of the country, its diplomatic isolation, and the deployment of a monstrous campaign of lies and slander about socialism.

Yet revolutionary Russia withstood the three years of armed struggle forced upon it by the imperialists and continued to hold out to foreign nations the hand of friendship, confirming its desire for peace and peaceful coexistence with states with opposite social systems. Describing Soviet Russia's peaceful foreign policy, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs Georgi Chicherin said at a meeting of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee in June 1920: "We are guiding neither our system nor our power towards confrontation. . . . Our slogan has never changed: peaceful coexistence with other governments, whatever they represent."^{*}

The first representative conference in which the Soviet state participated was held in Genoa in 1922. It was there that Lenin's ideas concerning the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems were heard for the first time from an international rostrum. "While retaining the principles of communism as its point of view," went in part the Soviet delegation's declaration at this conference, "the Russian delegation recognises that the present historical epoch which allows for the existence in parallel of the old and the nascent social systems makes it urgently necessary that there be economic co-operation between

^{*} *Documents on Soviet Foreign Policy*, Vol. II, Moscow, 1958, pp. 638-39 (in Russian).

the states representing these two systems of property ownership...."* Soviet diplomats have invariably confirmed their belief in the principle of peaceful coexistence at every international forum in which they have since participated.

The Soviet socialist state's international position grew ever stronger along with its political and economic consolidation. There came a time when the USSR was diplomatically recognised, when our country began to take an active part in international talks and in the activities of international organisations.

In the 1930s, as a result of the aggression of the Japanese militarists against China and the establishment of the nazi dictatorship in Germany, universal peace found itself in real danger. The Soviet Union energetically participated in diplomatic activities to ensure collective security, signing treaties on mutual aid with France and Czechoslovakia, expressing its readiness to conclude a convention on mutual military aid with Britain, and as a whole doing all that could be done to prevent a world war. But at this stage, too, anti-communist feelings among the most reactionary ruling circles of the West took the upper hand: their policies led to the Munich deal with Hitler and their desire to use the fascists to strike a mortal blow against the land of socialism resulted in the outbreak of the bloodiest war in mankind's history.

The Second World War, nevertheless, demonstrated in practice the possibility of various kinds of co-operation—military, political, and economic—between the Soviet Union and the capitalist states united in an anti-fascist coalition. The differences in their social systems did not prevent them from joining in the struggle against the common enemy—nazi Germany. The Soviet Union not only defended its socialist gains and its national independence at the cost of the lives of 20 million of its sons and daughters who fell in the struggle against nazism, but also saved many

* *Documents of Soviet Foreign Policy*, Vol. V, Moscow, 1961, pp. 191-92 (in Russian).

countries from being enslaved by the nazis. The gratitude to the Soviet Union expressed on many occasions both orally and in writing by the top leaders of the USA, Britain, France, and of other capitalist states is known to all. It seemed then that they, like the rest of the world, had learned from that war the truth—that the new social system victorious in the USSR could not be destroyed by force of arms and that the West should, therefore, direct its policies towards peaceful coexistence and mutually profitable co-operation with the Soviet Union. The war years demonstrated that this was not only possible, but simply imperative in the interests of peace and the progress of mankind.

Through the Ice-Floes of the Cold War

Unfortunately, the lessons of the war were soon forgotten by the ruling circles of the United States of America, Britain, and the other imperialist powers. They developed the aggressive anti-Soviet doctrine of "containing communism", the policies "from positions of strength" and of "balancing on the brink of war". What were they hoping for? To prevent the victory of socialism in the countries of Eastern Europe and Asia, to "undermine" the USSR's economy by means of the arms race, atomic blackmail, and economic blockade, to paralyse the Soviet Union's foreign policy initiatives, and in the final count to establish imperialism's undivided rule worldwide.

It has recently become fashionable in the West to discuss the sources of the cold war. Many historians and political commentators in Western Europe and the USA are now looking back at the events of thirty years ago in a search for the precise date of the start of the cold war and the names of its fathers. As a rule they strive to lead their readers or listeners to believe that the cold war and the international tensions and the arms race resulting from it were to be blamed on the Soviet Union and on the "aggressive line" of the Kremlin.

Meanwhile, studies not only by progressive, but also by a number of bourgeois authors far from sympathetic towards socialism describe the events that led to the sharp post-1945 worsening of relations between the former Allies in the anti-Hitler coalition in reasonably thorough detail backed up by documents. Before the Second World War was over certain forces in the leaderships of the Western countries, the USA and Britain in the first place, worried not so much about defeating nazi Germany as about preparing for the post-war confrontation with the Soviet Union and their dream of making it obey the diktat of imperialism. It was precisely these forces that came to power in the United States of America after Roosevelt's death in the spring of 1945. Among their numbers were the country's new President Harry S. Truman, the future Secretary of State and author of anti-Soviet doctrines John Foster Dulles, the banker and the first Secretary of the Department of National Defence James Vincent Forrestal (who, incidentally, was later literally "maddened" by the "Soviet threat" and threw himself out of the window of a psychiatric hospital shouting that Russian tanks were invading Washington), and many other political figures and representatives of big business and the military who as early as 1945 had promulgated the taking of a "hard line" towards the Soviet Union. They were the ones who urged the manufacture of the American atomic bomb which was "tested" in August 1945 on Hiroshima and later on Nagasaki. One American political figure in fact said that the bomb dropped on Nagasaki was not the last bomb of the Second World War, but the first bomb of the third world war. And it was clear to all against whom that war was to be fought.

America's military-industrial complex was striving not to lose the huge profits to which it had become accustomed during the war by heightening international tensions and accelerating the arms race and stood behind the supporters of confrontation with the Soviet Union. The American *US News & World Report* wrote that in the

formula "cold war" the USA's leaders had found something similar to a "perpetual motion machine" for the economy, a method for extracting vast sums of money from the tax-payers who financed the arms race. The journal recognised that if all the possibilities offered by the cold war were used to the full, the money inflow would be practically unlimited. (Skipping ahead in time, it should be said that in the following years the American military-industrial complex did not do at all badly out of the cold war, earning itself trillions of dollars all in all.)

The very term "cold war" was invented, as is well known, by the US government adviser on foreign policy matters after the war Bernard Baruch, a financier, and was later given currency by the well-known publicist Walter Lippmann, who used it as a title to a series of articles.

The part of main trumpeter of the cold war was given to Winston Churchill who came out in March 1946 in the American town of Fulton with a provocative anti-Soviet speech. The threats contained in it and his blackmail of the Soviet Union were demonstratively applauded by his select American audience with Harry S. Truman at their head. Churchill's speech in the town of Fulton is considered to be the date on which the cold war was officially declared.

Although not a few attempts are still being made today in the West to falsify the truth about what took place then, to deny the universally known facts about the reasons for the cold war and who was to blame for it is becoming ever harder. Thus, the American historian Arthur Schlesinger recognises in his book *The Crisis of Confidence* that after the Second World War the United States of America abandoned the policy of co-operation that had been followed during the fighting and, influenced by its possession of the atomic bomb, started down the path of aggression with the aim of liquidating Russia's influence in Eastern Europe and creating capitalist states around the Soviet Union's frontiers.

Soon after the beginning of the cold war American imperialism and its Western allies embraced the aggressive doctrine of "rolling back" communism. Its authors called openly for a preventive war to put an end to the socialist system in the USSR and in the People's Democracies. The Korean war (1950-1953), the attempted anti-socialist putsch in East Berlin (1953), the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary (1956), the formation of NATO and of other aggressive blocs, the "balancing" on the brink of "hot war", the all-out "psychological war" against socialism, the discrimination in the field of trade, and the formation of an immense anti-communist propaganda apparatus were the elements that made up the cold war (and, as can be seen from the events in Korea, not just a cold war) that imperialism waged against the socialist countries and which reached its apogee in the early 1950s. In those days the American leaders allowed themselves to mock the very term "peaceful coexistence" in public and to joke that only over their dead bodies would they ever allow such a coexistence with the Communists.

However, neither the cold war, nor the economic blockade, nor its undermining activities helped imperialism to prevent the formation and consolidation of the world socialist system, the restoration and headlong upsurge of the Soviet Union's economic and defence might. It was precisely this growth in the might of the socialist world that sobered the rabid supporters of the cold war.

In the international diplomatic arena the period from the mid-1950s to the early 1960s was notable for the Soviet Union's particularly active struggle for peace in accordance with the foreign policy programme elaborated by the 20th Congress of the CPSU (1956). Throughout that time the USSR provided an example of benevolence and goodwill, carrying out several considerable reductions in its armed forces and proposing a concrete programme for universal and total disarmament.

It was at this stage that the struggle for the acceptance

of the principle of peaceful coexistence took on a new scale and importance: firstly, it was already being defended not by the Soviet Union alone, but by the whole community of socialist states, giving it extra strength; secondly, this campaign coincided with the rocket and nuclear arms race which was threatening the very existence of whole nations—and the realisation of this, undoubtedly, added to the strength of the worldwide peace movement, making many socio-political movements abroad and millions of people of goodwill on all continents ally themselves with the socialist countries in the struggle for peaceful coexistence. Suffice it to say that as early as 1951 the famous Stockholm Appeal to ban atomic weapons was signed by over 500 million people worldwide. By the late 1950s the international peace movement had grown still larger and, naturally, exerted a certain influence in questions of war and peace on the West's ruling circles.

The proposition formulated and confirmed in the materials of the Communist parties' congresses that a new world war was not utterly unavoidable and could be prevented by the joint efforts of the socialist community together with the non-socialist states following peaceful foreign policies, the international workers' movement, and other forces fighting for peace was of tremendous significance in the introduction of the principle of peaceful coexistence into the practice of international relations. The appearance of a real possibility of preventing the outbreak of another world war meant that the objective conditions for the triumph of the principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems had been created and that furthermore this had become an objective necessity if human society was to develop. It was with all clarity that the peoples of the world were faced with the choice of either peaceful coexistence or catastrophic war. Naturally, the number of people and the politicians who expressed themselves in favour of peaceful coexistence grew with every passing day.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, fighting for

international recognition of the principle of peaceful co-existence, put the question more broadly, not seeing it as just a matter of excluding war from the relations between the socialist countries and the capitalist world. The new Programme adopted by the 22nd Congress of the CPSU in 1961 formulated in the following way what "the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems" meant. This was "renunciation of war as a means of settling international disputes, and their solution by negotiation; equality, mutual understanding, and trust between countries; consideration for each other's interests; non-interference in internal affairs; recognition of the right of every people to solve all the problems of their country by themselves; strict respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries; promotion of economic and cultural co-operation on the basis of complete equality and mutual benefit".*

The policy of peaceful coexistence followed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries was actively supported by the Communist parties of other countries, progressive organisations, and all supporters of the peace movement. The Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in 1960 declared the struggle for the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems to be one of the main aims of the international communist and workers' movement.

The popularity and international acceptance of the principle of peaceful coexistence was objectively helped by the process of the disintegration of imperialism's colonial system, which began after the Second World War, by the appearance on its ruins of new African and Asian states, and by the awakening to active political life of the multimillion masses of the so-called Third World. The newly independent states, naturally, turned to the experience of their ally, the USSR, and the whole socialist camp in elaborating the standards for their relations between themselves and with the outside world. Lenin's

* *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1962, pp. 505-506.

concept of peaceful coexistence exerted a great deal of influence on the elaboration of the five famous principles "pancha shila"—abstention from the threat or use of force, the settling of disagreements by peaceful means, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, equality and self-determination of nations, and so on—which were widely supported at representative international forums of the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The Soviet Union's great successes in the economic, scientific and technological fields, its peaceful initiatives, and the tangible increase in Soviet society's international links all led to a marked change in the international climate in the late 1950s and the early 1960s, to rapid growth of friendly interest in the Soviet Union and in the theory and practice of socialism.

Just one example by way of illustration. 4 October 1957. The launching into space of the first Soviet *sputnik*. The Soviet *sputnik* caused a sensation abroad. In a matter of hours this Russian word entered the vocabularies of innumerable languages, found its way into newspaper headlines, and was broadcast into the ether. Even the usually restrained Austrians congratulated us, Soviet people, with unfeigned delight and amazement.

A few years later, on 12 April 1961, the world was shaken by an even greater sensation: the first man was in space—a Soviet citizen, Yuri Gagarin. "*Sputnik*", "*Gagarin*", "*peaceful coexistence*"—these words with every passing day grew in popularity worldwide.

The 1960s are sometimes called the decade of unused possibilities insofar as the relations between the socialist and the capitalist countries are concerned. This in the first place refers to Soviet-American relations. The breakdown of the cold war's concepts and psychology which began in the late 1950s took place in stops and starts in the American leadership. The Washington politicians who were beginning to realise the hopelessness of their former anti-communist military-strategic doctrines and the un-

avoidability of the recognition of the principles of peaceful coexistence with the USSR were opposed by the aggressive wing of the American leadership, by the military-industrial complex, and by ultra-rightist forces. As a result, the United States' foreign policy line towards the USSR was marked in the 1960s by inconsistency and contradictoriness.

In May 1960 the US militarists undertook a deliberate provocation—they sent a U-2 spy plane into the USSR's air space. The plane was shot down by a Soviet rocket, but the provocation itself and the position taken on this matter by the US Government put a stop to the normalisation that had just set in in American-Soviet relations.

In the early 1960s the American leadership visibly gave way to the pressure of the militarists, considerably accelerating the arms race and making the attempt at armed intervention against revolutionary Cuba. This provoked the so-called Caribbean crisis (October 1962), the most dangerous moment since the Second World War and one that could have ended in thermonuclear warfare. All this had a strong sobering effect on the members of the US ruling circles. Washington afterwards began to try to ease the tension in American-Soviet relations and as a result it was possible in late 1963 to conclude the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water. This was the first important step towards restraining the nuclear arms race in the post-war period.

This trend towards detente was again halted by the West's actions, in the first place those of the American militarists. Lyndon Johnson, who had become President of the USA after John Kennedy's assassination, took the course of involving the USA ever more deeply in the Indochinese conflict and in 1965 sent a many-thousand-strong American army to Vietnam. The years of American imperialism's armed aggression against the heroic people of Vietnam will always remain a black spot on America's conscience.

US leaders furthermore tried to depict the intervention in Indochina as a "peripheral conflict" which ought not to affect Soviet-American relations. Certain leading Americans even hinted that they would "agree" to peaceful coexistence if the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries "forgot" about Vietnam, "sacrificed" it for the sake of developing relations with the West and of international detente. The Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries understandably rejected this provocative approach. Basing themselves on the supreme Soviet foreign policy principle—that of proletarian internationalism—the leaders of the CPSU and of the Soviet state repeatedly declared that a cessation of the American aggression against the Vietnamese people was the indispensable condition for the normalisation of Soviet-American relations.

The development of normal relations between the socialist and capitalist states was also hindered by the aggravation of the international situation resulting from the war between Israel and Arab countries in 1967 when the imperialist countries openly sided with the Israeli aggressors. The events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 during which the West in accordance with its latest anti-communist doctrine of "building bridges" undertook an attempt to restore capitalism in that country by means of a "quiet counter-revolution" and to "extract" that country from the socialist community also exerted a negative influence on the normalisation of relations between East and West. All this, of course, could not but lead to Soviet-American relations, and the relations between the socialist and capitalist countries in general, remaining throughout the second half of the 1960s at practically a standstill.

The Main Trend

Meanwhile in those years, too, an unhaltable trend was becoming ever more apparent in the international arena—the trend towards world socialism consolidating its posi-

tions at the expense of those of the imperialist camp. In the field of economics this was most clearly seen in the headlong growth of socialism's share in the world economy. In volume of industrial production the Soviet Union overtook the FRG, Britain, and France taken together and by 1977 the country's output was about 80 per cent that of the USA.

Socialism's economic successes are particularly striking if one examines the countries which are members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA). With a population of less than one-tenth of mankind (about 370 million), their share of world industrial production rose from 10.4 per cent in 1946 to 33 per cent in 1970, while by 1976 this had risen still further to reach 37.5 per cent.

In other words, per capita industrial production in the CMEA countries is over three times as great as the world average, while in total volume it is greater than that of the USA or of the West European Common Market. More important still, however, is that socialism is continuing to maintain its lead in economic growth rates; between 1950 and 1975 the volume of industrial production in the CMEA countries increased twelvefold. Between 1970 and 1976 their industrial production increased by 56 per cent, while in the developed capitalist countries the figure was a mere 17 per cent.

The ruling circles in the West could, of course, not but recognise the socialist countries' achievements in yet another field closely related with economics—the consolidation of the military might and the defence capability of the socialist community. It was undeniably true in the 1970s, admitted President Nixon, that the Soviet Union possessed a mighty and modern strategic force that was close and in certain categories superior to the American one in numbers and technological and economic capacities.

It is all these changes that have forced the West to recognise the illogicality of an armed confrontation with the USSR and its allies and to build its relations with the

socialist countries on the basis of the principle of peaceful coexistence.

The political and ideological fields in the late 1960s saw a further strengthening of the unity of the fraternal socialist countries and of the world communist and workers' movement. The West's hope that there would be a "falling out" between some or other countries of the socialist community proved to be utterly unfounded; the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968-1969 demonstrated the unreality of plans to export counter-revolution to Eastern Europe. Neither were the imperialist strategists' hopes for the socialist community and the world communist movement being "undermined from within" as a result of the Chinese leadership's transition at that time to a policy of open hostility towards the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to come true.

At the same time, the contradictions within the imperialist camp grew sharper. The United States, which had come out of the Second World War as the predominant force in the capitalist world and which produced almost half that world's total industrial output, has in the last few decades started to lose its dominant position, while its share in the world economy has begun to shrink visibly and competition between Western Europe and Japan has grown still more vicious. The currency crisis has turned out to be profound and chronic, economic slumps are occurring more frequently in the capitalist countries, the class struggle has grown more bitter, and the contradictions between imperialism and the national liberation movement have become more marked. The leading imperialist powers are feeling with ever greater force the negative consequences of the arms race. This has led to a situation in which even within these states' ruling classes voices are to be heard ever more often speaking out in favour of a radical review of those countries' relations with the socialist ones.

The aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism in the 1960s is another sign of the worsening of the crisis

within bourgeois society. For the USA the 1960s will be remembered as the period of that country's defeat in Vietnam, the period of inflation, of climbing crime rates, of worsening conditions in the towns, and of the worst civil disturbances of the century. The events of those years are fresh in the minds of many: the rise of the Black people's movement, mass demonstrations against the aggression in Vietnam, students' demonstrations fired upon.

The two main trends of the post-war period thus affected each other. The first was the steady strengthening of the positions of socialism which, as Lenin foresaw, turned into an international force able to exert "a decisive influence upon world politics as a whole".* The second trend was the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, the weakening of its international and domestic positions leading to the creation of a fundamentally new situation in the world arena in which it has become possible to achieve recognition by the West of the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems.

* V. I. Lenin, "Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 148.

II

THE PEACE PROGRAMME IN ACTION

There are moments in international relations when changes that have slowly and quietly built up suddenly lead to a sharp qualitative shift, to a rapid change in the pattern of international life. Such a sudden shift has been taking place right before our eyes since the early 1970s, although, as has been shown above, the preparations for it were gradual and took place over the whole of the post-war period.

The new historical stage in the struggle for the peaceful coexistence of states belonging to two opposite world systems was opened, as has already been said, by the 24th Congress of the CPSU which was held in the spring of 1971. It was this congress that put forward the soundly based programme for the struggle for peace and international security—a complex of foreign policy measures of unprecedented scale and significance involving all the most important trends in the struggle for detente and the acceptance of the principle of peaceful coexistence. I would like here to quote in full the short section of the CC CPSU's Report to the 24th Party Congress presented by the General Secretary of the Central Committee; this section later came to be called the Soviet Peace Programme all the world over. Leonid Brezhnev announced the following urgent tasks of the USSR's struggle for peace and international security:

"First.

"—To eliminate the hotbeds of war in Southeast Asia and in the Middle East and to promote a political settlement in these areas on the basis of respect for the legitimate rights of states and peoples subjected to aggression.

"—To give an immediate and firm rebuff to any acts of aggression and international arbitrariness. For this, full

use must also be made of the possibilities of the United Nations.

"—Repudiation of the threat or use of force in settling outstanding issues must become a law of international life. For its part, the Soviet Union invites the countries which accept this approach to conclude appropriate bilateral or regional treaties.

"Second.

"—To proceed from the final recognition of the territorial changes that took place in Europe as a result of the Second World War. To bring about a radical turn towards detente and peace on this continent. To ensure the convocation and success of an all-European conference.

"—To do everything to ensure collective security in Europe. We reaffirm the readiness expressed jointly by the participants in the defensive Warsaw Treaty to have a simultaneous annulment of this treaty and of the North Atlantic Alliance, or—as a first step—dismantling of their military organisations.

"Third.

"—To conclude treaties putting a ban on nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological weapons.

"—To work for an end to the testing of nuclear weapons, including underground tests, by everyone everywhere.

"—To promote the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world.

"We stand for the nuclear disarmament of all states in possession of nuclear weapons, and for the convocation for these purposes of a conference of the five nuclear powers—the USSR, the USA, the PRC, France, and Britain.

"Fourth.

"—To invigorate the struggle to halt the race in all types of weapons. We favour the convocation of a world conference to consider disarmament questions to their full extent.

"—We stand for the dismantling of foreign military bases. We stand for a reduction of armed forces and arma-

ments in areas where the military confrontation is especially dangerous, above all in Central Europe.

"—We consider it advisable to work out measures reducing the probability of accidental outbreak or deliberate fabrication of armed incidents and their development into international crises, into war.

"The Soviet Union is prepared to negotiate agreements on reducing military expenditure, above all by the major powers.

"Fifth.

"—The UN decisions on the abolition of the remaining colonial regimes must be fully carried out. Manifestations of racism and apartheid must be universally condemned and boycotted.

"Sixth.

"The Soviet Union is prepared to expand relations of mutually advantageous co-operation in every sphere with states which for their part seek to do so. Our country is prepared to participate together with the other states concerned in settling problems like the conservation of the environment, development of power and other natural resources, development of transport and communications, prevention and eradication of the most dangerous and widespread diseases, and the exploration and development of outer space and the world ocean.

"Such are the main features of the programme for the struggle for peace and international co-operation, for the freedom and independence of nations, which our Party has put forward."*

How the West reacted to this programme is interesting to recall. Literally every single bourgeois news agency and radio and television station carried reports on that same day, 30 March 1971, about the foreign policy section of the CC CPSU Report. Headlines such as "The Soviet Peace Programme", "Brezhnev's Six Points", "The Soviets Go Over to the Attack", and so on were front-paged. The progressive press instantly supported the USSR's new peace

* *24th Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1971, pp. 37-39.*

proposals. As for the bourgeois newspapers, they for the first few days produced no long articles or commentaries about the Soviet proposals. They seemed to be in a state of some kind of shock, thunderstruck by the scale of these proposals and unable, as they had frequently done before, simply to pass them over in silence or label them as "propaganda", "a new manoeuvre of the Soviets", and so on. It was only two or three days later that the "big" bourgeois papers and journals carried articles in which their commentators attempted to analyse the CPSU Congress' foreign policy programme and that representatives of the Western countries' ministries of foreign affairs began to answer journalists' questions on the subject. Furthermore, the general tone of their reactions was identical: while on the one hand recognising the significance of the CPSU's and the Soviet state's new peace initiative, they took up skeptical positions and tried to demonstrate that the CPSU Congress' Programme was "utopic" and "unreal", asserting that it could not be implemented for decades at least. The commentators' opinion in general added up to the following: each of Brezhnev's six points is already a practically impossible programme; taken together they are totally unreal.

It is difficult to say what really lay behind this reaction—cold-war inertia preventing Western politicians and propagandists from seeing the new prospects brought by the 1970s for the reorganisation of international relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence and co-operation or the West's fear of finally losing the initiative in international affairs to socialism?

Only a few years have passed since that memorable spring. It would be hard to find in the whole of recent history another period so rich in important foreign policy actions. Furthermore, no one can today deny that world politics have developed in this time in precisely the direction outlined in the 24th CPSU Congress' Peace Programme and later developed at the 25th Congress of the Soviet Union's Communists.

To Eliminate the Hotbeds of War!

Let us look at the facts. The first point of the Peace Programme called for the elimination of hotbeds of war in Southeast Asia and the Middle East.

For many years the most dangerous hotbed existed in Indochina. By the armed aggression it began in the mid-1960s against the Vietnamese people, American imperialism hoped to suppress the national liberation movement in Southeast Asia and to test the strength of socialism's positions in that part of the world. To achieve this, they used the factor of the geographical separation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (now the Socialist Republic of Vietnam) from the "continent" made up by the countries of the socialist community and of the overwhelming and at first sight indubitable military superiority of the USA over the DRV's armed forces and the South Vietnamese patriots, and also of the "special positions" taken by the Chinese leadership who refused to join the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in helping the Vietnamese people.

Imperialism, however, clearly underestimated the Vietnamese people's will for freedom and the force of the socialist countries' fraternal solidarity. The Soviet Union, true to its internationalist duty, gave heroic Vietnam the most aid. The Vietnamese patriots fought for their independence and freedom with Soviet weapons. The USSR did all it could to provide Vietnam with effective aid and support. It was from the Soviet Union that the Vietnamese people received everything they needed to repulse imperialist aggression. Soviet ships delivered tons of freight to ports in North Vietnam—weapons, ammunition, fuel, food—providing in all for two-thirds of the DRV's total freight turnover. Thousands of Soviet specialists worked for the Republic's economy and, moreover, many thousands of Vietnamese were given professional and military training in various towns of the USSR.

I would like here to remark upon the difference in principle between Soviet aid to fraternal Vietnam and the

American "participation" in the Vietnam war. The USSR and the other socialist states helped the people of Vietnam at their request. In order to repulse the American aggressors and to defend the country's independence, we did not send our troops to Vietnam. The "participation" of the Americans was expressed by open armed aggression against the Vietnamese people, by the sending to Indochina of an immense expeditionary force, by the killing of hundreds of thousands of peaceful Vietnamese citizens, and by the bombing of towns and villages located many thousands of kilometres from the USA.

The mighty movement of solidarity with Vietnam that grew up in the socialist and developing countries and also in a number of capitalist states, including the USA, called for an increase in practical aid to the Vietnamese people and sharply condemned the imperialist aggression.

In the Soviet Union the movement for solidarity with Vietnam and for aiding our Vietnamese brothers became a truly national one. In July 1973 the Soviet Government resolved to consider the credits previously made available to fraternal Vietnam as gratuitous aid. Money for the Vietnam fund was collected throughout the Soviet Union and Soviet workers, office employees, pensioners, and young people went to do unpaid work on Saturdays and Sundays in order for the money thus earned to acquire and send the fighting nation the goods, medicines, and equipment it needed. The Soviet Union's factories adopted the slogan "Green Lights for Orders for Vietnam!". Soviet schoolchildren collected exercise books, pens, and briefcases for their fellows in far-off Indochina. Hundreds of reports about this solidarity which was expressed in the most varied ways were published in the Soviet press. One example: when it was announced on the radio that Vietnamese children were in dire need of medicines, the schoolchildren of just one region of the Soviet Union rapidly collected 165 tons (!) of medicinal herbs which were immediately sent to the Vietnamese together with many tons of medicines made available by our country's medical

institutions. The high spirit of internationalism typical of the Soviet people was displayed to the full in those years.

At the same time, the Soviet Union used all its influence in the international arena to help embattled Vietnam. General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev at his meetings with the President of the United States put forward demands for the immediate cessation of the American aggression in Vietnam. The Soviet Union contributed greatly to the conclusion of the Paris Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam (January 1973). The Land of Soviets displayed a similar drive at the UN and at many international negotiations.

The victory of the Vietnamese people, the unification of the North and South of the country into the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the victory of the People's Democratic Republic of Laos which has started on the building of socialism, and the achievement of total independence by the people of Kampuchea all contributed to the creation of a new situation in Indochina, the consolidation there of the trends towards strengthening peace and security for the nations of that part of the world, and the ending of the long and difficult period when that region was the most dangerous hotbed of war in the world.

In late 1975 a Vietnamese delegation led by First Secretary of the CC of the Communist Party of Vietnam Le Duan visited the Soviet Union and signed the Soviet-Vietnamese declaration, an agreement on economic aid for Vietnam, and a protocol for co-ordinating the economic plans of the two countries for 1976-1980. In accordance with these documents, the Soviet Union is providing Vietnam with a great deal of help in restoring and developing its economy and in creating and consolidating the economic basis of socialism there. Basing itself upon its unchanging line, upon the principles of socialist internationalism, and taking into account Vietnam's vital needs, the CC CPSU and the Soviet Government resolved to make available to Vietnam a large credit on easy terms to be used for aid in the development of its power industry, metallurgy, heavy engi-

neering, and other branches of industry, for the development of agriculture, and for raising the living standards of the Vietnamese people.

"On behalf of the Party, the government, and the Vietnamese people," said Comrade Le Duan in his speech at the 25th Congress of the CPSU, "we express sincere, deep-felt gratitude to the Communist Party, the USSR Government, and the Soviet people, to our dear Soviet brothers for their regarding support and assistance to the Vietnamese people as a command of the heart, as a matter of their conscience."*

* * *

The second most dangerous hotbed of war in the world after Indochina has for many years been the Middle East. In the last quarter century war has flared up there four times—in 1948, 1956, 1967, and 1973—endangering universal peace. All these outbreaks of fighting have had one main cause—the expansionism of Israel's ruling top brass, their desire to enlarge its territory at the expense of its Arab neighbours. Thus, in June 1967 Tel Aviv occupied over 60,000 square kilometres of the territories of Egypt, Jordan, and Syria. It is clear that Israel could not have followed so barefaced a predatory policy had it not enjoyed the material aid and political support of international imperialism and Zionism.

The Soviet Union and the socialist states together with many of the developing countries waged an active diplomatic struggle for the adoption of such documents—within the UN, among other organisations—as would ensure a political solution of the Middle East crisis. As a result, on 22 November 1967 the famous Security Council Resolution No. 242 was adopted, calling for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories. At

* *Our Friends Speak*. Greetings to the 25th CPSU Congress, Moscow, 1976, p. 22.

the same time, the Soviet Union continued to provide Egypt and other Arab countries with a great deal of economic and military aid.

The adventuristic course followed by Israel since 1967, its refusal to return the occupied territories to the Arab countries, and its constant and self-assured sabre-rattling led in October 1973 to the largest ever outbreak of fighting in the whole of the Middle East's history. Military specialists assert that these battles were notable for the fact that more modern military equipment was used in them than at any time since the Second World War.

This time the military engagements were quite different from those of 1967. The Arab armies demonstrated a far greater fighting capacity and ability to make use of modern weapons. Egyptian troops successfully forced the Suez Canal and took up strong positions on its eastern bank, having considerably shaken the Israeli army which lost hundreds of tanks, planes, and so on. The political situation was also different: the Arab countries formed a united front, undertaking a number of joint diplomatic and economic actions (for example, introducing the embargo on Middle East oil deliveries to the USA and other allies of Israel, a certain reduction in the quantity of oil being extracted, and so on). The measures taken had quite serious consequences for the Western economy and this is understandable if one takes into account that in the course of 1973 alone the Arab countries were due to export about 800 million tons of oil.

During the October war of 1973 the Soviet Union, true to the line confirmed at the 24th Congress of the CPSU—to support the national liberation movements and to repulse imperialist aggression—aided the Arab peoples greatly both by its supplies of arms and its political and diplomatic support. It was with the USSR's support that the UN Security Council Resolution No. 338 of 22 October 1973 which bound Israel to agree to a ceasefire with the Arab countries was passed; soon afterwards, the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East was called.

As a result of the Arab peoples' armed struggle and of the support and aid of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries it was possible to work out an agreement whereby the Israeli and Arab troops were divided by a buffer zone occupied by a UN Emergency Force. The Israeli army was obliged to withdraw deep into the Sinai Peninsula, while Egypt restored its sovereignty over both banks of the Suez Canal and measures were taken to reduce the number of troops and the quantity of military equipment deployed by the opposing armies. The agreement also stated that "neither Egypt nor Israel . . . consider this to be the final peace agreement. It is only the first step towards the just and durable peace which will be established in keeping with Resolution 338 of the Security Council and within the framework of the Geneva Conference on the Middle East". In the spring of 1974 an agreement was also signed on the disengagement of the troops on the Syrian-Israeli front on the Golan Heights.

These agreements do not mean, it is true, that the Middle East hotbed of tension has finally been done away with—Israel continues to occupy large stretches of Arab territory. It is because of the counter-actions of Israel and of its imperialist backers that for the time being yet another key question in the Middle East is not being solved, that of the restoration of their lawful rights to the people of Palestine, including the right to form their own state. The attempts made in recent years to find a "partial solution" to the Middle East problem while avoiding the questions around which everything else revolves have not been crowned with success.

In these conditions the Soviet Union is continuing to stand by its principled position in relation to the normalisation of the situation in the Middle East. The main elements of this position were laid out again in March 1977 in the speech made by General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev at the Congress of the Trade Unions of the USSR. The Soviet Union considers that any final docu-

ment (or documents), concerning peace in the Middle East should be based on the principle that it is impermissible to acquire territories by means of war and that all the states of that region have the right to independent existence and to security. The inalienable rights of the Palestinian Arabs, including their right to self-determination and to form their own state, should be ensured.

The withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied by them since 1967 should be provided for; this could be done in stages, over several months. The frontiers between Israel and its Arab neighbours, which must be declared to be final and inviolable, should be clearly determined. With the agreement of the states in question demilitarised zones in which UN Emergency Force or observers could be sent for a specified period might be established on both sides of these frontiers.

The Soviet proposals envisage the cessation of the state of war in the Middle East from the moment Israeli troops have been completely withdrawn from the occupied Arab lands, the establishment of peaceful relations, and the acceptance by both sides of the obligation to respect each other's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and inviolability. The fulfilment of all these conditions for a peaceful settlement could be guaranteed by the UN Security Council or, perhaps, by individual powers such as, for example, the Soviet Union, the USA, France, and Britain.

All these proposals ought to be the subject of discussion at the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East. The Soviet Union, as co-chairman of this conference and a state located in the immediate vicinity of that region, is ready to play the most active role in reaching a settlement in the Middle East.

An even more negative consequence for the common Arab cause resulted from President Sadat's attempt to see "eye to eye" with Israel without taking his Arab allies into consideration. Sadat's visit to Jerusalem angered the Arab world and damaged Egypt's relations with a number of Arab countries. At the same time, Sadat, helped by the

USA and Israel, strove to make the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East unnecessary of working for negotiations on a separatist basis, although the majority of Arab countries as well as the Soviet Union which supports them would have liked to see a proper conference called. All this has still further complicated the situation in the Middle East and has made a generally acceptable solution more remote.

The experience of recent years confirms that only such a fundamental and all-round solution can turn the Middle East into an area of peace. If this is not done the possibility of a new outbreak of fighting in that part of the world or of a repetition of bloody events like those that recently took place in the Lebanon cannot be excluded. The world public is profoundly worried by such a prospect and attentively following the developments in the Middle East, supporting the just and all-encompassing proposals made by the USSR for the settlement of the Middle East question.

For a Radical Turn Towards Detente and Peace in Europe

One of the tasks put forward in the 24th CPSU Congress' Peace Programme is "to bring about a radical turn towards detente and peace" on the European continent. This has for centuries been the dream of the peoples of Europe. And for all those centuries the European continent has seen ever bloodier wars break out one after the other. Historians have calculated that of all the large and small wars mankind has gone through in its history half, that is to say over 7,000, took place in Europe.

Other figures, however, should be recalled if one is to have a complete picture: despite its relatively small size—a mere 10.5 million square kilometres, that is to say three times smaller than Africa and 4.5 times smaller than Asia—the European continent, including, of course, the European

part of the USSR, produces half the world's industrial output and disposes of immense material and cultural riches created over the centuries. Human blood, however, has been shed in large quantities all over this continent: the wars of the 19th century in Europe resulted in the deaths of six million people, while the two world wars of the 20th century, which also broke out in Europe, carried away 65 million human lives. Those who have travelled know that on no other continent can so great a number of sad memorials and common graves be found.

Twice in the life of a single generation it was precisely over its Western frontier, that is to say from Europe, that death and destruction remembered to this day by every Soviet family came to the Soviet Union.

The struggle for peace and security in Europe was seen by the CPSU as its most important foreign policy task from the very first days of the existence of the Soviet state. It was from as early as the 1920s that mutually profitable connections, co-operation between Soviet Russia and such West European countries as Germany, France, Britain, Italy, and others began to be organised. These countries were among the first to accord the USSR diplomatic recognition. This was to a considerable extent due to economic factors since, as Lenin pointed out, "the bourgeois governments are well aware that the economic life of Europe cannot be adjusted without Russia"*.

The main trends of the USSR's European policy were recorded in the first international treaties and agreements signed at the first international conferences in which the Land of Soviets participated. As CC CPSU Politburo member and USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Andrei Gromyko pointed out in one of his speeches, during the conferences at Genoa and Rapallo the Party of Soviet Communists—in another situation and at a time when the balance of power was different—already then devoted priority atten-

* V. I. Lenin, "Interview with the Correspondent of *The New York Herald*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 417.

tion to the situation in Europe, struggling for the implementation of Lenin's principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems and for the strengthening of European security.

It was in the 1920s and 1930s that Soviet proposals for disarmament and collective security were put forward for the first time at international conferences held in Europe and with none other than European countries that the Soviet Union's first non-aggression and neutrality treaties were signed. It was in Europe, too, that the Soviet Union made its first attempts to create a regional collective security system—this was in the 1930s, that is to say, at the time when German nazism was preparing the Second World War.

Everyone remembers how an anti-Hitler coalition was formed during the war, proving that it was possible for states with differing social systems to be allies. The treaties, signed then between the USSR, Britain, France, and other European countries, and the resolutions of the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam conferences, in which the USA also participated, created a real basis for post-war co-operation and the ensurance of security in Europe and worldwide.

However, the cold war in which West European imperialism joined to form a united anti-communist front together with the United States of America destroyed the tentative trend towards solid peace on the European continent. The year 1949 saw the formation of the aggressive North Atlantic Treaty Organisation—NATO; the remilitarisation of West Germany began; the economic and cultural links that had taken shape in the past were broken; and all the USSR's proposals for disarmament and the creation of a European collective security system were rejected.

It was to take over two decades for this trend to begin developing again. It is now a generally recognised fact that the process of detente taking place today began at the end of the 1960s on none other than the European continent.

There are a number of reasons for this. The first and most important of these is that socialism has secured a sure and solid victory in Eastern Europe and that the majority of the world's socialist countries are in Europe. The total volume of their industrial production has for a long time already considerably exceeded that of Western Europe. The socialist states, joined in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, are carrying out a joint foreign policy that is exerting a decisive influence on international relations in Europe in a spirit of detente and co-operation. The defence might of the countries united in the Warsaw Treaty Organisation is a factor of no small importance and without a doubt sobers even the West's wildest hotheads, forcing them to abandon their mad plans to destroy socialism.

The realisation that an armed conflict would be disastrous on the thickly populated and relatively small European continent has without a doubt played a role in leading certain far-sighted figures in the ruling circles of the West European countries to agree in recent years to a review of the concepts of the cold war that turned Europe into a powder keg. The European continent is, in fact, literally "stuffed" with troops and weapons; millions of soldiers, thousands of tanks, and hundreds of NATO and Warsaw Treaty rockets face each other on its territory. Suffice it to say that the American army has 7,200 nuclear warheads in Europe. It is easy to imagine what will happen if all these weapons begin to "speak": millions of people will die and many European towns will disappear.

It cannot be said that Europe's peoples and public opinion there have only recently come to realise this truth. On the contrary, it is precisely in the European countries, which have the most organised working class and mass Communist parties in the West, that a widespread movement for peace developed after the war. The memory of two world wars which no person in his sound mind could wish to see repeated is still quite fresh in the minds of the majority of Europeans. And it is no coincidence that

precisely here, in Europe, there developed immediately after the Second World War an active movement for peace, the first mass organisations of supporters of peace were founded, their first international congresses held, such progressive organisations uniting the new generation as the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students were founded, and a start was made in organising the World Festivals of Youth and Students for Solidarity, Peace, and Friendship.

At this point one cannot but also mention some other reasons that pushed the European countries away from confrontation and towards normalising relations. These included the desire, natural for neighbours, to expand their economic co-operation, the historical closeness and intertwining of the fates of many European nations, and so on. All these reasons led the countries in the same direction as the main factor—a constant change in the balance of power on the European continent in favour of socialism and its policies of peace, security, and co-operation.

Under the influence of this and the other above-mentioned factors elements of realism began to appear in the policies formulated by certain West European leaders. The first in this respect was France's President, General de Gaulle, who much earlier than other Western leaders came to understand the pointlessness and danger of an armed confrontation between the two world systems. In his book *Mémoires d'espoir* Charles de Gaulle stated that to start a world conflict in this day and age would be madness. "This being so, I consider it necessary for the Soviet Union to become an integral part of the organised co-operation between states that I would like to see on the whole of our continent. This would guarantee the security of all between the Atlantic and the Urals."^{*} Having soberly considered the changes that have taken place in Europe and understood the advantages of co-operating with the

^{*} Charles de Gaulle, *Mémoires d'espoir*, t. I, *Le renouveau* 1958-1962, Paris, 1972, p. 183.

socialist countries, de Gaulle set out to establish relations with the Soviet Union that were principally new for that time. His course was continued by President Georges Pompidou and by the late 1960s-early 1970s the two countries had already gained a certain amount of experience in co-operating in various fields. An important part was played in this by the Soviet-French summit meetings that soon became regular.

All this took place relatively recently, but today it is already strange to recall that France's course was at first met with fury and obstructed by the majority of other Western powers. From the other side of the Atlantic came calls to "punish the turncoat", British newspapers published caricatures showing the "Russian bear" suffocating the "French Marianne" in its arms, and NATO generals thundered about France "creating a breach" in the West's united anti-Soviet front—all the usual devices of those who lagged behind the times.

Meanwhile, the trend towards detente and co-operation was forging a path and attracting more and more new countries and West European political leaders.

New prospects also opened before Europe as a result of the important change in the relations between the USSR and the Federal Republic of Germany. Ever since the end of the war the Soviet Union together with its allies based themselves on the fact that the foundations of stable peace in Europe lay above all in the recognition of the inviolability of the European states' frontiers. For all those years, however, such a recognition did not suit the Western powers and in the first place the FRG where revanchist sentiments for the recreation of the "Reich within its 1937 frontiers" were strong.

Life itself confirmed the hopelessness of such pretensions. Willy Brandt who became Chancellor of the FRG in 1969 declared soon after taking up this post that the German people needed peace in the full meaning of that word both with the peoples of the Soviet Union and with those of Eastern Europe. In 1970 Brandt's government

displayed far-sightedness and considerable courage by concluding treaties with the USSR and Poland in which the inviolability of frontiers, including those between the German Democratic Republic and the FRG and the Western frontier of Poland was confirmed, thereby creating the preconditions for a favourable development of relations between the socialist countries and the FRG and an improvement of the situation in the whole of Europe.

The positive changes in France's and the FRG's policies were not the only examples illustrating the situation in Europe in the early 1970, although these were extremely important. What, briefly, has taken place in the relations between the Soviet Union and the countries of Western Europe since then?

Soviet-French relations have risen to new heights and have come to be seen as a model for relations between states belonging to the world's two opposing systems. Soviet-French summit meetings have been held regularly in recent years: Leonid Brezhnev and Georges Pompidou met in 1970, 1971, twice in 1973, and also in 1974. These meetings played an exceptionally important part in creating the current atmosphere of co-operation between the two countries and have invariably provided new impulses for developing practical links in the fields of economy, science, culture, and so on.

Of especial significance was the visit paid to France by General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev in October 1971 and his signing together with President Pompidou of the Principles of Co-operation Between the USSR and France. This historic document states that the two countries' policy of concord and co-operation based on their long tradition of friendship and suiting the aspirations and mutual interests of the peoples of the USSR and France is to form the permanent basis of their relations and to be a permanent factor in international life.

Certain organs of the Western press not for nothing called the Principles of Co-operation Between the USSR and France a charter for peaceful coexistence. This was

truly one of the first documents signed by the Soviet Union and an important capitalist power to have as its basis the concept of peaceful coexistence and to create a real basis for mutually profitable co-operation on a large scale.

Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, who was elected President of France in 1974 after Georges Pompidou's death, continued the development of Soviet-French relations. In December 1974 Leonid Brezhnev had his first meeting with President Giscard d'Estaing, in the course of which the two leaders once again reaffirmed their belief in the policy of concord and co-operation followed by the Soviet Union and France from as early as 1966 and expressed themselves in favour of joint efforts to consolidate peace in Europe and the rest of the world. At a meeting in Rambouillet an agreement was signed between the USSR and France on economic co-operation for the period 1975-1979 envisaging the doubling and, if possible, the tripling of the trade turnover between the two countries as compared to the preceding five-year period.

The French President paid an official visit to the USSR in October 1975. The Declaration on the Further Development of Friendship and Co-operation Between the Soviet Union and France, a new step in these two states' efforts to contribute to the further improvement of the situation in Europe and the whole world, was greeted with great interest throughout the world after its signing in the Kremlin. In many countries the press pointed out that at the first meeting between the French and Soviet leaders since the European Conference the two countries had confirmed their desire to consolidate the result of that conference and more concretely to implement the points listed in the Final Act agreed upon in Helsinki.

Many projects in the field of economic, industrial, and scientific and technological links are now being successfully carried out, trade between the two countries is growing rapidly, and the ten-year programme for increasing co-operation in the economic and industrial fields is being

implemented. New agreements about co-operation in the sphere of the power industry, civil aviation and the aircraft industry, and tourism were also signed during the French President's last visit to Moscow.

That is how one of the USSR's most important European policy tasks is being implemented in practice: to develop and consolidate in the interests of Europe and of the whole world relations of co-operation with a state that stands out in the West as a pioneer in the normalisation of relations with the socialist countries. "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the entire Soviet people put a high value on friendly relations with France and the French people," said Leonid Brezhnev in one of his speeches. "The development of these relations in the political, economic, scientific, and cultural fields is one of the major trends of Soviet foreign policy."*

It was the most important achievement of the early 1970s that the "knotty question of Germany", as the diplomats called it, was at last undone. By this is meant that a number of measures connected with the normalisation of relations between the socialist countries and the FRG, recognition by the West of the sovereignty of the GDR, and the solution of the problem of West Berlin were taken. The active efforts of the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries, intensive diplomatic negotiations, and meetings between the Soviet and West German leaders led to the ratification in June 1972 of treaties between the Soviet Union and the FRG and between Poland and the FRG. A little earlier, in September 1971, representatives of the USSR, the USA, France, and Britain had signed a quadripartite agreement on West Berlin that eliminated a dangerous source of tension in the heart of Europe; this provided, in particular, that the Western sectors of Berlin, as before, were not a part of the Federal Republic of Germany and would not be governed by it in the future. This agreement constituted a strong blow

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 189.

against those forces which had ever since the war come out with claims on West Berlin, making it a "frontline city" and an outpost for subversive activities against the GDR and the other socialist states.

The conclusion of all these treaties and agreements cleared the way for a new stage in Soviet-West German relations. Trade and economic, scientific and technological, and cultural links between the two countries began to develop rapidly. General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev's May 1973 visit to the FRG was of truly historic significance for Europe and, I dare say, for the whole world. And this was not just a matter of the new and important agreements signed in Bonn and giving real meaning to the relations between the two states in the fields of economy, culture, and science. The point was that two countries whose relations had for many years been affected by the heavy moral and political burden of the past were involved. The problem was, therefore, not only to accomplish a diplomatic, but also a psychological turn away from hostility towards normal relations of mutual understanding, respect, and co-operation. The whole world saw and took note of the outstanding personal contribution made by Leonid Brezhnev to the achievement of this profound change.

Shortly after Leonid Brezhnev's visit to the FRG yet another document of historic importance was signed—the June 1973 Treaty on the Bases of Relations Between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany which put an end to the long period of open hostility and confrontation between the two German states and began their transition to normal relations. A treaty was then signed between Czechoslovakia and the FRG and diplomatic relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Hungary were established. In 1973 the GDR and the FRG became members of the United Nations, completing the list of political and international legal actions needed for the normalisation of relations between the socialist countries and the

FRG and the solution of Europe's most difficult problem—that of Germany—on the basis of the recognition of the realities that had taken shape on the European continent since the Second World War. This was an important contribution to the implementation of the task set at the 24th Congress of the CPSU—to ensure a radical turn towards detente and peace in Europe.

Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's government continued the line of developing relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. In October 1974 Helmut Schmidt paid a visit to Moscow during which the two countries confirmed their belief in the policy of detente and co-operation and signed important documents and agreements to consolidate this line.

The efforts of the Soviet Union and of its allies to normalise relations and develop co-operation with such leading West European states as France and the FRG was accompanied by active foreign policy moves to improve links with the so-called small European countries. There are many such countries on the continent and their economic and political weight is quite considerable. The Soviet Union based itself in this matter on the fact that these countries stood to gain from detente and increased co-operation and could make themselves felt no less than the great powers.

Relations between the Soviet Union and its northern neighbour, friendly Finland, are developing extremely well. These relations are an example to all of the fruitfulness of the long and consistent implementation of a policy of peaceful coexistence. The Soviet Union also maintains traditionally friendly and stable links with Europe's neutral countries—Austria, Sweden, and Switzerland—and with such states as Italy, Norway, the Netherlands, Denmark, Luxembourg, and Iceland. The USSR has agreements on trade, scientific and technological, and cultural co-operation with each of these countries.

One country—Britain—for a long time kept to the sidelines of the process of international detente. The ruling

class, the Conservative party, and the country's propaganda media greeted with poorly concealed hostility the Peace Programme put forward by the 24th Congress of the CPSU, tried to prevent its implementation and to complicate the situation in Europe, and even undertook so provocative an action as the expulsion of a large group of Soviet workers from London in autumn 1971. "Swimming against the current" like this soon threatened Britain with international isolation and, at the same time, exposed British Tories as opponents of peace and international security; Britain was finally obliged to run in order to "jump onto the bandwagon". When a Labour government came to power in 1974, it declared its readiness to develop constructive relations with the USSR and to contribute to the process of detente and co-operation.

In February 1975 Britain's Prime Minister Harold Wilson paid a visit to Moscow and negotiations between him and the Soviet leaders were held. As a result, important documents concerning the links between the two countries in the political, economic, and other fields were elaborated. Two long-term programmes—about the development of economic and industrial co-operation and about the development of co-operation in the field of science and technology—were signed.

The statement in the Joint Soviet-British Communiqué that the two countries undertook to further international detente was of great political import, as well as the Declaration on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons also signed then in Moscow. The results of the Soviet-British negotiations concerning bilateral relations and topical international problems were on the whole given high marks by the world press and by political circles. It had once again been proved that no state, if it was concerned about security and the expansion of international co-operation, could stand on the sidelines of the process of detente or omit to make its own contribution to it.

The positive phenomena in European life placed the question of a qualitatively new stage in detente—the col-

lective elaboration and agreements of norms for peaceful coexistence and multilateral co-operation on the basis of realities as they had taken shape in Europe and in the interests of peace and the security of all the continent's peoples—on the agenda. It was precisely this aim that a European conference on security and co-operation, for which the socialist countries had long and consistently called was to achieve. This conference deserves a section to itself.

The Historic Helsinki Conference

It would be hard, I think, to find in the whole of recent history another international meeting so persistently called for and, at the same time, so hard to achieve. As far back as the 1954 Berlin meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs of the USSR, the USA, Britain, and France on the German problem the Soviet Union proposed a project for a "general European treaty of collective security in Europe" and in July of that same year it put forward a concrete proposal for the calling of an all-European Conference on this question. The problem of European security also occupied a central place at the Geneva meeting in summer 1955 of the heads of state of the four great powers at which, along with other questions, the problem of East-West contacts was discussed, to all intents and purposes for the first time since the war. The Soviet representatives even then spoke in favour of the expansion of contacts in the economic and cultural fields and in favour of more frequent exchanges of specialists, delegations, and public figures. The Western countries, however, acted in the spirit of the cold war and declined both the idea of a collective security treaty and the Soviet Union's concrete proposals concerning contacts.

In the following years the Soviet Union put forward new proposals for strengthening security in Europe. In July 1966 the Bucharest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty states published the Declaration on Strengthening Peace and Security in Eu-

rope and expressed its readiness to take part in an all-European Conference which it was proposed to call at a time convenient to the countries involved.

The call to turn Europe into a continent of co-operation, peace, and mutual understanding was supported by the April 1967 Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties in Karlovy Vary (Czechoslovakia) and also by the June 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow.

By 1972 the majority of European states had responded positively to the proposal that a conference be called and had also accepted Finland's initiative concerning the holding in Helsinki of multilateral consultations on the matter. (These were held in the Finnish capital at the ambassadorial level in November 1972-June 1973.)

A number of years thus elapsed between the time when the socialist countries put forward concrete proposals for an all-European Conference and the time when practical preparations for it by means of multilateral consultations were started in Helsinki. It took so long, because certain large and influential forces in a number of countries of Western Europe and also in the United States of America came out against the calling of this conference: these were NATO's militarist circles, the leaders of the FRG's Christian Democratic Union and Christian Social Union opposition bloc, the majority of British conservatives, the representatives of the US military-industrial complex, Zionist organisations, and a number of American congressmen. Certain Western press organs tried to develop a propaganda campaign against the calling of the conference, played on the myth of the "Soviet military threat" in Europe, and found fault with the aims of the socialist countries which had put forward the idea of holding an all-European Conference.

The leadership of the People's Republic of China played its part in the "orchestra" of those hostile to the cause of detente. On the eve of the European Conference and even as it began its work the Chinese leaders redoubled

their invitations to Peking to those West European politicians who had spoken out against the conference. In their talks with the representatives of West European countries the Chinese leaders tried to frighten them with "Soviet hegemony in Europe" and strongly encouraged them to increase their military preparations. The Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Vice-Premier, and other Peking leaders made trips to Western Europe for the same purpose.

Despite all their efforts, however, detente's opponents were not able to torpedo the preparations for the conference, all the more so as these preparations corresponded to the most important political processes taking place in Europe and worldwide: the development of Soviet-French and Soviet-West German relations, the peaceful dialogue that had just begun between the USSR and the USA, and the general improvement of the international situation.

After long multilateral preparatory consultations in Helsinki, the first stage of the all-European Conference was finally held in July 1973. This was an outstanding event. The ministers of foreign affairs of the European states and of the USA and Canada gathered together for the first time in the continent's post-war history. The ministers ratified the final recommendations of the multilateral consultations, decided on the further agenda of the conference's work, and put forward their governments' views about the most important aspects of security and co-operation in Europe.

In his speech at this forum the USSR's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Andrei Gromyko, emphasised that from the point of view of the turn towards consolidating peace and reducing tension the all-European Conference was on the main road of the current evolution of the international situation. We would like Europe to be a region of peace, said the Minister, a continent whose inhabitants need never again fear aggression.

The USSR's Minister of Foreign Affairs explained the main principles on which, in the Soviet Government's opin-

ion, relations between the European states ought to be founded; these were at the same time laid out in the Soviet delegation's draft for a General Declaration on the Foundations of European Security and the Principles of Relations Between States in Europe. In his speech Andrei Gromyko devoted a great deal of space to the prospects for trade and economic and scientific and technological co-operation in Europe and also to cultural exchanges and contacts between the European countries' public figures, young people, and the representatives of similar professions. It was precisely such contacts that would create trust between the peoples of Europe, confirm the ideals of peace, equality, and good-neighbourliness in international relations, and put an end to the psychological consequences of the cold war and the practice of interfering in the internal affairs of other nations.

That the socialist countries' approach was constructive is testified to not only by the speeches made by their ministers of foreign affairs, but also by the fact that the delegations from the USSR, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Poland contributed at the first stage in Helsinki concrete draft documents on every point on the conference's agenda. These were all designed to help expand co-operation between the participant states.

The conference's second, very responsible, difficult, and long stage (it lasted with intervals from August 1973 to July 1975) began in Geneva very soon after the foreign ministers had left Helsinki. It is sometimes asked why this second stage took so long: was it really not possible to draw up the text which was then signed by the leaders of the European states and of the USA and Canada sooner and with less difficulties?

The answer lies not at all in the length of the final document of the conference (a total of about 100 typewritten pages), but in the complete novelty of the problems which the participant states' delegations came up against in their efforts after a quarter century of confrontation to formulate the propositions on which relations

on European continent were to be rebuilt. It may be said that this was history's first collective experiment in elaborating norms to govern the mutual relations and co-operation of states with differing social systems under conditions of peaceful coexistence. These propositions furthermore touched on not just one, but all the most important spheres of international relations—politics, economics, and intellectual life—at once.

How did the four hundred diplomats who gathered in Geneva carry out their work in practice? In accordance with the agenda ratified by the ministers of foreign affairs, the following working organs of the conference were created: the Co-ordinating Committee—the leading organ composed of the heads of all the delegations, three commissions, and twelve subcommissions. Each of the commissions and subcommissions dealt with a particular set of problems: the principles to govern interstate relations ("the ten commandments" was what we negotiators called them jokingly between ourselves); co-operation in the field of trade, science, technology, and environmental protection; contacts in the field of culture, education, and information; the steps to be taken after the conference. All 35 participant states were represented in each of these working groups, that is to say all problems were discussed on a Europe-wide basis. During the first few months all the delegations described their own positions and contributed draft documents on the questions under discussion and then went on to the drawing up and editing of the text of the final document to be signed by the heads of state at the third, and main stage of the conference.

All the work was done on the basis of consensus, that is to say, of complete unanimity. This meant that no sentence or even word in the document was considered approved if even one delegate objected to it. This rule, although it not infrequently slowed down the work because it led to long searches for "common denominators" and because certain delegations abused it, at the same time ensured that the procedure was democratic, that all

countries, large and small, socialist and capitalist, received equal treatment and had their interests taken into account.

The amount of work done in Geneva was impressive: the various bodies of the conference met officially about 2,500 times (this figure excludes many thousands of unofficial as well as multilateral and bilateral meetings), contributed 4,700 documents, drafts, and proposals on every possible subject, and drew up the thirty-thousand-word text of the Final Act. Long discussions preceded all of these things.

It should also be said at this point that bilateral meetings between the leaders of the great powers during 1973-1975 were a great help to and speeded up the work of the diplomats in Geneva. Problems to do with the European Conference were invariably raised at the meetings in those years between CC CPSU General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev and President Giscard d'Estaing of France, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of the FRG, Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Great Britain, US President Gerald Ford, and the leaders of other countries. Many important questions on which the success of the work in Geneva and also of the main stage of the conference in Helsinki would depend were discussed at these meetings.

At last the many-sided and painstaking work of the conference's bodies was completed by the drawing up of the draft document which was presented to the leaders of the participant states at the third and main stage of the conference in Helsinki.

Those who had the good fortune to be present in Helsinki's Finlandia Palace on 30 July-1 August 1975 and even those who watched the television broadcasts of this meeting could not have failed to feel that they were taking part in an event of universal importance. The ceremonial setting, the top political leaders, presidents, and prime ministers of 33 European countries, the United States of America, and Canada each rising up in turn to speak,

and the ceremony of the signing of the Final Act of the European Conference were all most impressive.

The conference's task was unprecedented in history: collectively to determine norms for the mutual relations between states with differing social systems which would ensure the further development and spread of detente and increase mutually profitable co-operation in the interests of all the nations of Europe.

This main aim of the European Conference was expressed in the very first sentences of the Final Act signed in Helsinki which say that the heads of state of the participant states were motivated by the political will to improve and intensify their relations and to contribute in Europe to peace, security, justice, and co-operation and determined to give full effect to the results of the conference and thus to broaden, deepen, and make continuing and lasting the process of detente. . . . These words contain the philosophy of the whole European Conference and of its results. To make the process of detente multi-lateral, dynamic, and lasting were tasks that had never before been set by the peoples and states of Europe or of any other part of the world. Furthermore, this task was not simply set by the European Conference, but also to a considerable extent solved thanks to the fact that this conference elaborated and agreed upon the basis of European security and drew up a co-operation programme that was acceptable to all the countries concerned.

The main points of the Final Act signed in Helsinki, its core, were the principles it laid out to govern relations between the states. The Soviet Union and its Communist Party may pride themselves on the fact that these principles are based on Lenin's conception of peaceful coexistence, a conception for which the Soviet people have fought with conviction and persistence ever since the Great October Socialist Revolution.

It is enough simply to glance at a list of the political principles approved in Helsinki in order to see that they touch upon the holy of holies of each state individually

and of all the conference's participant countries together. In the first section of the Final Act, called the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations Between Participating States, the following norms are declared:

I. Sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty;

II. Refraining from the threat or use of force;

III. Inviolability of frontiers;

IV. Territorial integrity of States;

V. Peaceful settlement of disputes;

VI. Non-intervention in internal affairs;

VII. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion, or belief;

VIII. Equal rights and self-determination of peoples;

IX. Co-operation among States;

X. Fulfilment in good faith of obligations under international law.

"The participating States," it is said in the Final Act, "express their determination fully to respect and apply these principles, as set forth in the present Declaration. . . ."

The principles governing interstate relations promulgated in Helsinki are of great significance to the consolidation of peace and security in Europe. They reaffirm the already legally binding points which were previously included in bilateral interstate treaties and other documents signed in recent years between the Soviet Union and France, the USA, Great Britain, Italy, Canada, and also between other countries.

This code of principles was praised highly by the delegation leaders in their speeches in Helsinki's Finlandia Palace. The declaration of principles, said Finland's President Urho Kekkonen, describes the basic position of the whole European Conference. Although it is based on the principles and aims of the UN, this declaration goes further than the UN Charter inasmuch as it applies these principles to the concrete realities on the European continent, puts interstate relations on a qualitatively new level,

and makes such principles as that of sovereign equality and co-operation between states more accurate and meaningful.

US President Gerald Ford declared that the United States would contribute to the full implementation of the principles contained in the European Conference's declaration. The other heads of state taking part in the Helsinki meeting also made similar announcements.

When the results of the European Conference became known, the opponents of detente put forward the propagandistic thesis that the principles approved in Helsinki "contained nothing new", that they were not "binding", and that they were advantageous only to the East and not to the West.

Let us look more closely at these "arguments". Firstly, it should be noted that the Helsinki principles go a lot further than other international documents and declarations in their coverage of various aspects of interstate relations. So all-encompassing a complex of norms for interstate relations has never before been elaborated on any continent or indeed anywhere in the world. In this sense Europe, by its successful holding of the conference in Helsinki, made an important collective step towards consolidating its security.

As for the pessimistic comments about the allegedly "non-binding nature" of the Final Act of the European Conference, the following may be said in reply: the great political significance and moral force of the points agreed upon in Helsinki derive both from the fact that they were officialised by the signatures of the heads of 35 states (and that in itself is unprecedented in history) and that all these leaders declared at the Finlandia Palace that their governments intended to implement the points contained in the Final Act and to be guided by them in their foreign policies. This was the maximum that could have been achieved at that stage of detente, a maximum that the peoples of Europe had only been able to dream about a few years previously.

All in all, the political principles agreed upon at the European Conference are designed to ensure what CC CPSU General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev in his speech in Helsinki called the right of the peoples of Europe to peace. The peoples have earned this right. I have already mentioned above how many wars have swept Europe throughout its history and how many millions of lives they took.

It is to the advantage of all states and peoples equally that there should be peace, security, and co-operation. The results of the European Conference mean that there are no winners and no losers, that no one gained and no one lost anything. It is a victory for good sense. Everybody won: the countries of the East and of the West, the peoples of the socialist and of the capitalist states, the members of alliances and the neutral states, small countries and large ones. It was a victory for all who value peace and security on our planet.

All the principles concerning interstate relations approved in Helsinki are of supreme importance. The European press, however, remembered the continent's historical experiences and made the most of the principle of the inviolability of frontiers. One only needs to glance at a political map of Europe with its multitude of criss-crossing and broken frontier lines in order to understand the significance of this problem on the continent: the majority of wars Europe has been through began precisely with territorial pretensions and the overrunning of frontier posts. Thus, it was precisely the recognition of the inviolability of Europe's post-war frontiers that made it possible a few years ago to ensure the decisive move towards detente, towards the normalisation of relations, and towards greater co-operation between the socialist and capitalist states of Europe. Helsinki was a new and most important collective step in this direction.

In its commentaries the world press also emphasised the significance of the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs. It is no secret that attempts to dictate to

other people what they should think about their way of life and to interfere in their internal affairs by subversive methods were for a long time the inseparable attributes of the cold war and of the "psychological war" which prevented the normalisation of interstate relations and poisoned the international atmosphere. The Final Act signed in Helsinki now defines such practices as impermissible. From the rostrum of the Finlandia Palace the head of the USSR's delegation reminded the delegates of the Soviet Union's invariable position on this question—that no one can dictate to other nations how to manage their internal affairs or what laws they should pass. This must be done by the people of each state and by them alone. Any other approach to this stands on shaky foundations that endanger international co-operation.

In connection with the agreements reached on political questions at the European Conference, it should be kept in mind that the participants went further than merely promulgating a list of the principles to govern their mutual relations. The Final Act contains sections on how to implement some of these principles, on measures for building up trust, and on other aspects of security and disarmament. In particular, it provides for the signatory states to give a 21-day warning of any large military manoeuvres in which more than 25,000 troops are involved within 250 kilometres of the frontiers of another participant state, the mutual invitation of observers to such manoeuvres, advance warning of any large troop movements, and several other clauses.

It was previously unheard of in Europe for states to inform each other in advance of their intentions to carry out large military manoeuvres. The concentration and regrouping of large numbers of troops that take place during such manoeuvres can, especially when this happens near the frontiers of another state, give rise to a certain amount of anxiety if the neighbouring states do not know the aims of the exercise in advance. The signatory states have now agreed to inform each other in advance, on a

voluntary basis, and within the framework of precise pre-agreed criteria, of any large military manoeuvre.

The European Conference did not in fact examine disarmament questions *per se*, but the measures mentioned above together with other clauses of the Final Act concerning the general aspects of disarmament constitute an important step towards consolidating security on the European continent. This is the beginning of a qualitatively new level in building up trust between states, and the Soviet Union is in favour of advancing further down this path, of adding military detente to political detente.

One more aspect of the declaration of basic principles for interstate relations approved in Helsinki needs to be examined here.

For a long time certain influential forces in the imperialist camp refused to recognise the political, social, and territorial realities that took shape in Europe as a result of the Second World War and of post-war development. In brief, doubts were cast on the permanence of the victory of socialism in the countries of Eastern Europe, on the formation of a sovereign socialist state—the GDR—on German land, and territorial changes and frontiers were “not recognised”. As I have already said above, the post-war imperialist doctrines of “containing” and “rolling back communism” to all intents and purposes sought the overthrow of the new system in the socialist countries of Europe, the severance of their alliance with the USSR, and the review of frontiers.

The signatures of the heads of the capitalist states of Western Europe, the USA, and Canada have been affixed to a document that declares the sovereign equality of all peoples, their right to choose their own future, the inviolability of the frontiers of all the states in Europe, and the principle of non-intervention in each other's internal affairs and this is now seen in the international arena as the summing up of the results of the Second World War and as a *de facto* recognition by the West of the social and territorial realities of post-war Europe.

The approval in Helsinki of a set of principles by which states bind themselves to be guided in their interrelations is thus of great and far-ranging significance. And this significance will grow the more fully and effectively these principles are implemented. In his speech in Helsinki Leonid Brezhnev said that "it is very important to proclaim correct and just principles of relations among nations. It is no less important to see that these principles are firmly rooted in present-day international relations, are put to practical use and made the law of international life not to be breached by anyone".* From the high rostrum of the European Conference the General Secretary of the CC CPSU once again declared that the Soviet Union's peaceful foreign policy was directed towards the consolidation of these principles in international relations.

One further point about the historic meeting in Helsinki ought also to be mentioned here. This is that, unlike many of the political forums of the past, the European Conference did not just determine the political norms for interstate relations in Europe under detente, but in many ways also contributed to the materialisation and meaningfulness of the detente process itself. The Final Act signed in Helsinki describes a wide and clear programme for the development of interstate contacts in the field of trade and industry, provides for certain joint projects, and defines the most promising spheres of scientific and technological co-operation, including environmental protection work; this was the first time that measures to increase contacts between institutions and people on a multilateral basis in the field of information, culture, and education were agreed upon. The implementation of these measures will make international life in Europe fuller, healthier, and more useful for all its peoples and each person individually.

Take, for example, so vitally important a field for each

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 580.

state as international trade and economic links. In recent years these have grown rapidly in scale although here, too, there is still a great deal that could be done.

In the European Conference's Final Act the signatory states outlined a wide-ranging series of measures designed to increase trade and economic and scientific and technological co-operation such as: increasing contacts between trade organisations, firms, and banks; making commercial deals easier; exchanging needed information; expanding the material base of tourism; co-operation in personnel training; increasing international standardisation, and so on. It is pointed out that the participant states "will endeavour to reduce or progressively eliminate all kinds of obstacles to the development of trade", and to contribute to its steady growth, recognising "the beneficial effects which can result for the development of trade from the application of the most-favoured-nation treatment".

A special section of the Final Act was devoted to industrial projects of interest to all. The most promising fields for the implementation of such large-scale joint projects are named as the exchange of electric power in Europe with the aim of making the most rational use of the capacity of power stations; co-operation in research on new energy sources and, in particular, in the field of atomic energy; the development of road networks and co-operation with the aim of creating a single shipping system in Europe; co-operation in the field of research into and the designing of equipment for freight shipment by various kinds of transport.

No less wide-ranging a programme is outlined in the Final Act in the field of interstate scientific and technological co-operation. The following most promising fields for such co-operation are listed: agriculture, power industry, transport technology, physics, chemistry, computer and telecommunications technology, medicine and public health, space research, and so on.

The Final Act also describes a special series of measures touching on so urgent a problem for the people of Europe

and North America as environmental protection; this outlines measures for co-operation in the struggle against air, soil, and water pollution, the protection of the seas' ecology, nature protection and the organisation of nature reserves, improvements of the environment in inhabited areas, and so on. It can safely be asserted that these points in Helsinki's final document will affect the living conditions of each inhabitant not only of Europe, but of the whole planet.

Immense interest was aroused both in the countries that took part in the European Conference and in others by the resolutions passed in Helsinki in what is called the humanitarian field, that is to say, in the sphere of culture, education, and information. Since these questions occupy a special place in the present-day spiritual life of mankind and in the ideological struggle between the two world systems, we shall examine these in detail later. Here, though, I would like once again to emphasise the following: the whole complex of resolutions passed at the European Conference, including the political principles to govern interstate relations, trade and economic and scientific and technological co-operation, and the measures outlined for increasing humanitarian contacts make up a programme without precedent in the history of mankind for strengthening peace and co-operation between peoples and mark the beginning of a new stage in international detente.

The USSR and the USA: From Confrontation to Co-operation

It can without exaggeration be said that of all the problems of present-day international life Soviet-American relations arouse the most interest. This is quite understandable, since the whole of world politics has revolved around them in the post-war period.

There are a number of reasons for this. Firstly, the two greatest powers possess vast economic and military poten-

tials: over half the world's industrial production and by far the most arms, especially nuclear missiles, are concentrated in their hands. From a political point of view the relations between Moscow and Washington affect literally every single international problem: if tension increases between them, people on every continent grow anxious; if, on the other hand, the skies clear, it becomes easier to arrange co-operation and to solve difficult questions, however far from Moscow or Washington these have come up.

Secondly, it is not only a question of the two great powers' might and of their immense influence on world affairs. No two other states in the world so fully exemplify the two opposing social systems—socialism and capitalism. The history of Soviet-American relations expresses in concentrated form the most important trend of the whole of world politics in the 20th century—the struggle between the two world systems in which the USSR and the USA represent both different classes and different and opposite ideologies.

Putting these factors side by side helps one to understand better why the history of Soviet-American relations covers such a wide spectrum: from extreme hostility to a course aiming for peaceful coexistence and mutually profitable co-operation.

One other point should also be emphasised here: the history of the relations between the two countries is composed in the main of long periods of mutual goodwill and co-operation. Despite the fact that we are geographically far apart, that we are politically different and that direct contacts between us are not so very intensive, our two countries have in the past frequently been allies when our paths crossed in the world arena.

As far back as 1780 when the American people was struggling for its independence, Russia came forward with the idea of armed neutrality which contributed to the isolation of the British colonialists and greatly helped the rebelling North American states.

Many years later, when the Civil War between North and South was raging in the USA, Russia sent two naval squadrons to the American shores and thereby contributed to the North's victory by preventing the colonial powers from intervening in the war.

In reviewing the history of Russian-American relations one cannot but agree with the conclusion once drawn by President John Kennedy who said that the fact that our two countries had never fought with one another was almost unique in the relations between the world's largest powers.

Of course, it would be wrong to draw an unconditional parallel between Russian-American relations in the past and Soviet-American relations after the Great October Socialist Revolution. Their character has changed, having taken on a clear class colouring, as, too, has their significance for the rest of the world. The USA's ruling class, seeing in socialism a mortal threat to its capitalist system, took up a patently hostile stand towards Soviet Russia.

The Western press and foreign political figures have recently started to expatiate about the positive change in Soviet-American relations being due to the fact that the USSR's leadership has supposedly changed its positions as regards the USA and has abandoned its former basic principles, mainly for the sake of the advantages to be derived from economic co-operation with that most developed country in the capitalist world. On the other hand, the United States of America, they say, was always in favour of co-operation of this kind, but the Soviet Union "rebuffed" it.

This bourgeois propaganda thesis turns the truth inside out, to put it mildly. To convince oneself of this one need only leaf through a history of Soviet-American relations or look at its first few pages.

1917. America's ruling class and the bourgeois press react with extreme hostility to the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. In November 1917 the *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch* wrote that one good dose of buck-shot would

sweep the Bolsheviks off the face of the earth forever. The United States took part in the intervention and armed the whiteguard armies. At the same time, America's progressive people and its working class welcomed the birth of the new revolutionary society and organised a mighty movement under the slogan: "Hands off Soviet Russia!" This was the time when John Reed wrote his famous book *Ten Days That Shook the World*.

1918, May. Soviet Russia was beginning to transform itself and Lenin, considering it useful and necessary to broaden trade contacts with the capitalist countries, gave instructions for a plan for the development of economic relations with the USA to be drawn up. This plan, together with a list of American goods that Russia would have liked to get from the USA and also an offer of Soviet goods worth 3,000 million roubles, was sent to Washington through the head of the American Red Cross mission in Russia, Colonel Robins. The US Government rejected this offer.

1919, September. In his second letter to America's workers Lenin, foreseeing that there would be a "coexistence side by side of socialist and capitalist states"*, made it clear that he considered it possible and necessary for Russia and the United States to co-operate with profit on both sides.

1920. Lenin answered an American correspondent's question about what the bases of peace with America were: "Let the American capitalists leave us alone. We shall not touch them. We are even ready to pay them in gold for any machinery . . . useful to our transport and industries. We are ready to pay not only in gold, but in raw materials, too."**

* V. I. Lenin, "To the American Workers", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 39.

** V. I. Lenin, "In Reply to Questions Put by Karl Wiegand, Berlin Correspondent of *Universal Service*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 365.

1921. The first ever contract was concluded between the People's Commissariat of Foreign Trade and an American company, the document being signed for the latter by Armand Hammer. The contract was for 65 million kilogrammes of American wheat to be sent to Soviet Russia in exchange for furs, leather, and suchlike. "This is a small path leading to the American 'business' world," commented Lenin, "and this path should be made use of *in every way*."*

1924. The US Senate discussed the proposal that the USSR be accorded diplomatic recognition and resolved to set the matter aside until a radical change in the Soviet Union's socio-economic system took place.

As can be seen from the above, Lenin from the very first years of the Soviet state's existence formulated a principled course as regards the USA: we were ready to enter into mutually beneficial co-operation, in particular economic, on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. At the same time, the United States' ruling circles determined their own course: hostility towards Soviet Russia, refusals to co-operate with it, and a policy of isolating and not recognising the world's first socialist state.

The United States, in fact, refused the Soviet Union diplomatic recognition for 16 years, a far longer time than any other capitalist state. In 1933 the new US President, Franklin Roosevelt, said half in serious, half in jest that his wife had seen in an American school a wall map on which there was an immense blank patch. In reply to her question, she was told that mentioning the country involved was not recommended since it was the Soviet Union. This incident, said Roosevelt, was one of the reasons that led him to ask Mikhail Kalinin to send representatives to Washington to discuss the establishment of diplomatic relations.

Franklin Roosevelt, evidently, needed the story of the

* V. I. Lenin, "To J. V. Stalin for Members of the RCP(B) CC Politbureau", *Collected Works*, Vol. 45, p. 559.

blank patch on the map in order to demonstrate the lack of foresight of the USA's former leaders who "shut out" a vast country with which it would have been not less to the United States' than to the Soviet Union's advantage to be linked since that was the time of the West's gravest economic crisis.

Finally, on 16 November 1933, diplomatic relations were established between the USSR and the USA. "I am convinced," the Chairman of the USSR Central Executive Committee, Mikhail Kalinin, emphasised at the time in an address to the American people, "that now all the artificial barriers to full and varied exchanges between the peoples of our two great countries have been removed, this will be very good not only for both of us, but will serve the cause of mankind's economic and cultural progress and the cause of consolidating universal peace."

Active trade and economic and other contacts between the two countries developed in the period following the establishment of diplomatic relations between them. In the 1930s a fairly large number of American engineers helped the Soviet Union's workers to create a new technology and many Soviet scientists and specialists went to the United States for training. A military alliance took shape between the USSR and the USA during the Second World War and feelings of mutual sympathy grew stronger between the Soviet and American peoples. The victorious meeting on the Elbe has become a symbol of the friendship between the soldiers and peoples of our two countries.

The cold war that followed and lasted nearly a quarter century froze and poisoned Soviet-American relations. The administrations under Truman (1945-1952) and Eisenhower-Dulles (1952-1960) followed anti-communist policies and rejected the very possibility of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union. The next decade was to be called "the decade of lost opportunities" and saw Kennedy's and later Johnson's governments following inconsistent policies: on the one hand, they recognised the necessity for restructuring relations with the socialist countries on peace-

ful foundations and went so far as to conclude a certain number of agreements with the Soviet Union, while on the other, they continued the arms race, launched an aggression in Indochina, and so on.

The question of relations with the USSR was central during the US presidential elections of 1968. Those politicians who thought soberly called for the abandonment of the country's former and by then bankrupt anti-communist doctrines and for a return to realism, to a recognition of the change in the world balance of power in socialism's favour.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s such weighty factors as the Soviet-French rapprochement and the expansion of Soviet-West German relations contributed to the appearance of realist trends in the positions taken by the USA's ruling circles; the United States was in danger of falling behind its allies who were hurrying to begin a new chapter in the history of relations with the socialist world.

The Soviet Union, on its part, repeatedly declared its readiness to build relations with the United States of America that would be founded on the principles of peaceful coexistence and of mutually profitable co-operation in the interests of universal peace. "We proceed," it was said in the Report of the Central Committee to the 24th CPSU Congress, "from the assumption that it is possible to improve relations between the USSR and the USA. Our principled line with respect to the capitalist countries, including the USA, is consistently and fully to practise the principles of peaceful coexistence, to develop mutually advantageous ties, and to co-operate, with states prepared to do so, in strengthening peace, making our relations with them as stable as possible."*

A great deal of work was done through diplomatic channels after the Congress to discover spheres of possible agreement in the USSR's and the USA's positions. By May 1972, that is to say only a little over a year after the 24th Congress of the CPSU, the US President visited

* *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1971, p. 35.

Moscow—an event that was followed with great interest worldwide.

The May 1972 Moscow talks between the Soviet leaders and the US President were rightly called the most important event since the war by *The New York Times*. They resulted in the signing in the Kremlin of ten joint Soviet-American documents; furthermore, each of these would at any other time have been greeted as a historic event.

It should be pointed out that although 40 years had passed since the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the USA, the links between the two countries had to all intents and purposes no basis in international law in the form of bilateral treaties of a principled nature. This situation once again demonstrated how insecure Soviet-American relations really were. From this point of view the signing in Moscow by the General Secretary of the CC CPSU and the US President of the Basic Principles of Mutual Relations Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America was of exceptional significance. This document noted that the two sides would first “proceed from the common determination that in the nuclear age there is no alternative to conducting their mutual relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence. Differences in ideology and in the social systems of the USSR and the USA are not obstacles to the development of normal relations based on the principles of sovereignty, equality, non-interference in internal affairs and mutual advantage.”

This was the first time that the leading imperialist power had signed a document that fully accorded with the principles of peaceful coexistence—an immense historic victory for the Leninist conception of how mutual relations between states with differing socio-political systems should be conducted. This document was the main result of the 1972 Soviet-American summit talks.

The Basic Principles also contained other important points, in particular ones concerning the recognition of the two countries' security interests on the basis of equality and the renunciation of the use of or the threat to make use of

force, and also articles on trade and economic, scientific and technological, cultural, and other links between the USSR and the USA. All these points were later expanded and concretised in other documents signed at the Moscow summit meeting: agreements on co-operation in peaceful space exploration and research (this envisaged, in particular, the Soyuz-Apollo joint space flight which was so brilliantly carried out in 1975), in the field of medicine and public health, in ocean shipping, in science and technology, and on joining forces in environmental protection. The above list is not complete; a number of other agreements were also signed at the same time.

Naturally, a meeting between the leaders of two such great powers as the USSR and the USA could not fail to touch also upon key international problems—the situation in Europe, Indochina, and the Middle East—and the level of agreement reached on these questions was of great significance in deepening the process of detente on a world scale.

A number of agreements concerning the trade and economic links between the USSR and the USA, the opening of the Soviet Trade Mission in Washington and the USA Commercial Office in Moscow, and the methods for financing trade and the granting by America of credits for the Soviet Union to pay for machines and equipment purchased in the USA were signed in 1972-1973, developing from the understandings reached earlier in Moscow. In early 1973 agreements were signed on the granting of long-term credits amounting to 225 million dollars for the USSR to purchase American equipment, in particular for the Kama Motor Works and some other enterprises. This was the first time in the history of Soviet-American relations that such agreements on the granting of long-term government credits had been signed. The ideas of peaceful coexistence and mutually profitable co-operation promulgated in the Basic Principles of Mutual Relations Between the USSR and the USA were beginning to acquire real meaning in the field of economics and trade.

The next important stage in Soviet-American relations was reached when General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev visited the USA in June 1973. Nine important agreements and three protocols concerning various aspects of the Soviet-American relations were signed during this visit, bringing the number of agreements signed by the USSR's and the USA's leaders in 1972-1973 to about 20, that is to say, more than were signed throughout the whole 40 years over which diplomatic relations existed between our two countries. This was a fact of prime importance, since these agreements established the spheres in which the two countries were to co-operate and the lines this co-operation was to take in the future.

During a third summit meeting held in June 1974 in Moscow, the Soviet and American leaders came to the conclusion that it was imperative that the main line charted in the documents signed in 1972-1973 be implemented.

New agreements were also signed on this occasion in the Kremlin on co-operation in the fields of public health, the power industry, and housing, and other types of construction. The most important document signed on this occasion was the 10-year Long-Term Agreement Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to Facilitate Economic, Industrial, and Technical Co-operation. It was pointed out that the prospects for a considerable increase in the turnover of Soviet-American trade were favourable and steps were outlined for increasing co-operation in space exploration, the development of promising means of transport, environmental protection, and in increasing cultural exchanges. Agreement was reached in principle on the opening of Consulates General—of the USSR in New York and of the USA in Kiev and it was decided that others would be opened in other cities by both sides in the future.

The immense significance of these successful negotiations and of the agreements concluded for both the Soviet and American peoples and the whole of mankind hardly

needs to be demonstrated. They not only present us all with direct advantages even today, but they also offer us the prospect of still wider peaceful co-operation tomorrow.

One aspect, and I think it is the hardest to measure by official agreements and treaties, of the relations that have taken shape between us needs to be treated on its own: I am referring to the psychological relations between our two peoples, relations that were for a long time—due to the cold war—hostile. Not so very long ago it was typical for America's propaganda-dazed citizens to feel fear and distrust with regards to the Soviet Union. The newspaper headlines screamed and sought to frighten people at the height of the cold war. Worried people would ask when and where the third world war would start. Edward Teller, the father of the American atomic bomb, assured the Americans that the construction of bomb shelters would save 99 per cent of the population if there was nuclear war. The above is how a well-known author describes the psychological state of the USA's population during the cold war.

It is quite understandable that millions of Americans reacted guardedly to the steps being taken to normalise Soviet-American relations and to the news of the CC CPSU General Secretary's visit to the USA. On the day of his arrival, the *Christian Science Monitor* reported that many Americans brought up in the cold war spirit were shocked at the sight of the Red Flag with its hammer and sickle fluttering on the grey façade of the government building next to the White House.

But the new reality won. Intensive work to normalise Soviet-American relations and, most importantly, the practical results achieved by the USSR's and the USA's leaders began to change the psychological climate in both countries very quickly. The following example is indicative: during CC CPSU General Secretary Brezhnev's visit to the USA, a Harris poll came up with the result that 78 per cent of those questioned approved of Leonid Brezhnev's

visit to their country, while only 8 per cent expressed themselves against it. If one considers how deeply rooted the cold war psychology was in Americans and for how long they had been poisoned by it, the widespread approval in the country of the policy of detente was, according to Professor Fred Neal, an expert on international affairs, really amazing.

During his visit to the United States in June 1973 Leonid Brezhnev called for great care to be taken to protect and develop the young shoots of the good relations between the two peoples.

"To live in peace," he said on American television, "it is necessary to trust one another, and to trust—each must know the other better. We, in any case, want Americans to know, as fully as possible and truthfully, our way of life and our way of thinking."*

In order to achieve this aim, that is to say to improve our two peoples' mutual understanding, conditions today—after the colossal political changes that have taken place—are far more favourable than they were a few years ago. The number of cultural, public, and youth links between the USSR and the USA is increasing with every passing year, tourism is developing, student exchanges are becoming more frequent, more and more exhibitions are organised, and so on. America's young people are displaying increasing interest in the Soviet Union. This was clearly testified to by the success of the exhibition about Soviet young people when it toured a number of major US cities: hundreds of thousands of young Americans of both sexes visited it. Hundreds of American Senators and Congressmen have come on informal or official visits to the Soviet Union in recent years. The first ever delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet visited the United States in 1974, and in 1975 a delegation of American Senators and Congressmen came to the USSR. This growing two-way flow of people will, together with other political, economic, and

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 181.

cultural measures, gradually lead to the elimination of distrust and to a growth in our two peoples' understanding of each other.

The discussion connected with Richard Nixon's resignation and Gerald Ford's assumption of the presidency confirmed the seriousness of the changes towards favouring detente and improving Soviet-American relations that had taken place in the minds of most Americans in the last few years. Certain circles in the USA tried to use the situation that took shape then to cast doubts on the usefulness of the line towards increasing Soviet-American co-operation and detente. The overwhelming majority of politicians and of the American people in general, however, expressed themselves decisively in favour of this course. A public opinion poll taken in the USA at that time included the following question: Should the US Government continue its policy of improving relations with the Soviet Union? Of those questioned 72 per cent answered "yes" and only 10 per cent "no".

The world press also correctly interpreted the fact that President Ford addressed a personal message to General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev the very day after he assumed the post of head of state and a few days later, addressing Congress, declared that the new administration would remain faithful to the line of improving Soviet-American relations. In the thermonuclear age, President Ford said, there can be no alternative to positive and peaceful relations between our two countries.

This declaration of President Ford's was widely supported on Capitol Hill. The House of Representatives passed a resolution in support of the continuation of the USA's foreign policy line. The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs held a hearing on various aspects of the process of normalising relations between the USSR and the USA, and many influential Senators and politicians expressed themselves in favour of continuing this process. All this went to show that the new Washington Administration could feel easy about further increasing co-operation

and the mutual comprehension between our two great powers.

In November 1974 an important international event, the meeting between General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev and US President Ford, took place near Vladivostok. In the course of their wide-ranging and constructive exchange of views they confirmed that the Soviet Union and the United States were firm in their decision strictly and fully to implement the obligations they had previously taken upon themselves and to increase, without wasting time, the scale and intensity of their joint efforts in all ways to develop the process leading to constantly improving relations between the two countries and to make these changes irreversible. The agreement in principle on the matter of further strategic arms limitations achieved at this meeting was especially significant. All in all, the Vladivostok meeting showed that Soviet-American relations were, despite the leadership change in Washington, still good and that extremely important positive factors which would help consolidate peace worldwide had taken root in recent years.

That the Soviet Union and the United States continued the practice of holding summit meetings was of exceptional significance. It should be recalled that between the end of the Second World War and 1972 the leaders of the Soviet Union met with Presidents of the United States only five times: with Truman—at the Potsdam Conference in 1945; with Eisenhower—in Geneva in 1955 and at Camp David in 1959; with Kennedy—in Vienna in 1961; and with Johnson—in Glassboro in 1967. Because of the unrealistic stand taken by the USA's representatives all these meetings, except for the Potsdam one, produced minimal positive results.

Soviet-American summit meetings have become regular in recent years: in 1972—in Moscow; in 1973—in Washington and San Clemente; in 1974—in Moscow and the Crimea, and again that same year—near Vladivostok; and in 1975—in Helsinki at the Conference on Security and Co-

operation in Europe. All these meetings were of great significance both for Soviet-American relations and for international relations as a whole. Topical problems connected with the normalisation of the relations between the USSR and the USA, with the expansion of co-operation in a whole number of fields, with reducing the arms race, and with normalising the whole of the world situation were discussed and in many cases solved at these meetings. The very scale of these problems demanded that they be discussed precisely at the summit and the Soviet Union is in favour of continuing this practice which is now an important part of international detente.

In following the policy of improving relations and increasing mutually profitable business links with the United States, the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union, of course, keep in mind that the USA was and remains the leading imperialist country and that its class aims are contrary to those of the socialist states. Neither must it be forgotten that the positions of reactionary groupings, which still think in the categories of the cold war and want to continue the arms race and slow down detente, are still very strong in the United States. All these forces played their negative roles in 1976-1977 when, at first using the presidential elections as an excuse and later the "lack of experience" of Carter's new Administration, American-Soviet relations were to all intents and purposes "frozen" and sometimes even deteriorated.

Indeed, as Leonid Brezhnev emphasised in one of his speeches, "We are not surprised at these attacks on the part of the enemies of peace. We shall continue to proceed along our own path. Our foreign policy is supported by the entire Soviet people and the vast majority of people throughout the world, because it serves the noble aims of strengthening peace and security and providing conditions for the free development of all nations and the social progress of all countries."*

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 416.

III

THE 25th CONGRESS OF THE CPSU: FOR DISARMAMENT AND DETENTE

There is something symbolic in the fact that the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was held between 24 February and 5 March 1976 and figuratively and in fact marked the Soviet people's entry into the last quarter of the 20th century. The 75 years of this century that had already gone by were ones of triumph for the ideas of Marx and Lenin, ones in which the wind of history ever more fully inflated the sails of the ship called Communism. The 25th Congress confirmed that this ship is the flagship of social progress and of the struggle for peace on earth.

Socialism and Peace Are Inseparable

The 1971-1975 Five-Year Plan saw the Soviet Union leap ahead, in a manner unprecedented in any of its previous five-year plans, in the creation of the material and technological and cultural basis of communism. The volume of industrial production increased by 43 per cent. The Soviet Union leads the world in its output of a number of important products—coal, iron ore, cement, and others, and to these are now added steel, oil, and mineral fertilisers. The country's economic and defence potential grew markedly, agricultural output, despite difficult weather conditions, went up, and a considerable rise in the people's material and cultural standard of living was achieved.

The standard of living in the Soviet Union deserves to be specially considered, because in the final count it is precisely its constant raising that is the Party's main task.

Here are a few eloquent figures. Between 1971 and 1975, 75 million people in the Soviet Union had their pay raised; the incomes of another 40 million grew due to increases in the size of pensions, allowances, and grants; real per capita incomes went up by 24 per cent; 544 million square metres of housing were constructed; 56 million people had their living conditions improved. The above are only a few of the fruits of the Party's drive to improve the people's standard of living, a drive which directly depends on political conditions in the world and on the successes of the policy of peace and detente being followed by the Land of Soviets. This course will be pursued on an even greater scale in the Tenth Five-Year Plan that has just begun and beyond it.

The 25th Congress was informed that between 1976 and 1990 the Soviet Union would dispose of material and financial resources approximately twice as great as in the period between 1960 and 1975 thereby making it possible to solve grandiose socio-economic tasks. These include above all further increases in the well-being of Soviet people, improvements in their work and living conditions, considerable progress in culture, education, and public health—in other words, advances in everything that will contribute to making the socialist way of life better and to the all-round development of the individual under socialism.

The immense growth in industrial production (by 1980 the USSR will already be producing approximately 1,380 million megawatt hours of electricity, 640 million tons of oil, 170 million tons of steel, and so on) will be used by the Soviet state in the first place to improve the people's standard of living still further. It is in addition planned to build another 550 million square metres of housing, to increase the real per capita incomes of the population by 20-22 per cent, to increase payments to the population from the social consumption funds by 28-30 per cent, and so on, by 1980. Already in 1976, shortly after the 25th Congress of the CPSU, a resolution was passed to increase the wages of yet another 31 million Soviet working people.

The Soviet socialist state has for a long time now ensured free education, health care, and social security for its citizens; for nearly 50 years there has been no unemployment here; and in the USSR rents, public transport, books, and so on are the cheapest in the world. The state expends vast amounts of money on satisfying the people's main requirements.

But peace is needed if all these socio-economic programmes are to be implemented. Just as all the country's current successes would have been much harder or, perhaps, even impossible to achieve had we not enjoyed the blessing of peace for the last thirty years, so, too, will the tempo and scale of the building of communism in this last quarter of the 20th century to no little extent depend on the international situation, on whether peace is consolidated, on whether we prevent hotbeds of conflict from flaring up and a new and ruinous leg of the arms race from starting.

All this, of course, concerns not only the Soviet Union, but also the whole of the socialist community. The congresses of the Communist parties of the fraternal socialist countries were held in late 1975-early 1976 and showed that during the last few years of detente they have achieved no small successes in developing their economies and cultures and in raising their standards of living. The total economic potential of the socialist community has continued to grow.

Between 1971 and 1975 the CMEA countries' national income rose on average by 36 per cent, while real per capita incomes rose by 29 per cent. These stunningly rapid rates are being preserved: in 1976 Poland's national income rose by 7.5 per cent, and Czechoslovakia's—by 4 per cent; real per capita incomes in the GDR rose by 4 per cent, and so on. The socialist community has now become the most dynamic economic force in the world. Between 1971 and 1976 the CMEA countries' industries developed at four times the speed of those in the developed capitalist countries. In 1975 the socialist community countries' industrial

output was more than twice that of the Common Market countries. To the above it should be added that while in the last quarter century (1950-1975) the share of the leading capitalist states (the USA and its West European partners) in world industrial production has fallen from 65.4 to 41.4 per cent, the CMEA countries' share has risen over those same 25 years of peace from 17.5 to 37.5 per cent.

The drive to consolidate the material basis of world socialism and to increase economic co-operation still remains the main trend of the whole foreign policy activity of the Soviet state and of the fraternal socialist countries. Because of this the long-term comprehensive programme for socialist economic integration jointly approved by the CMEA countries is of especially great significance. This is raising the economic interaction of the socialist countries to an even higher level and leading to the joint development of natural resources for the common good, the joint construction of large industrial complexes designed to satisfy the requirements of all the participants in such endeavours, and to planned long-term co-operation between enterprises and even whole industrial branches in our countries. Trade between the socialist countries, which has already reached a very high level, is to grow even faster: between 1971 and 1975 the overall trade turnover between the CMEA countries doubled to reach a sum of over 70,000 million roubles in 1975. A new and large forward leap is to be made in the fraternal countries' trade and economic co-operation in the current five-year plan (1976-1980).

The close co-operation within the socialist community is not, of course, only of an economic nature, but also includes growing political, defence, and ideological co-operation. In recent years there have been regular multi-lateral and bilateral meetings of the leaders of the fraternal parties and states, important questions have been discussed within the framework of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, and co-operation has constantly increased between scientific,

economic, and cultural institutions, between the mass media, and so on.

All this is helping world socialism today to have a tremendous influence on the thoughts and feelings of hundreds of millions of people all over the world. The meaning of Lenin's prediction that given peace socialism would have a hundred times more influence on world affairs is becoming ever clearer. The future will without a doubt provide new testimonies to socialism's unlimited possibilities, to its historical superiority over capitalism.

The socialist countries are doing all that they possibly can in order for this future to be one of peace, in order for detente to grow stronger and for friendly co-operation between peoples to increase. This is in the interests of world socialism. "We make no secret of the fact," said Leonid Brezhnev at the 25th Congress of the CPSU, "that we see detente as the way to create more favourable conditions for peaceful socialist and communist construction. This only confirms that socialism and peace are indissoluble."*

Proceeding from this idea, the Congress of the Soviet Union's Communists set the following as its prime foreign policy task for the forthcoming period: while constantly consolidating the unity of the fraternal socialist states and developing their all-round co-operation in the building of the new society, to increase their active joint contribution to strengthening peace.

As was yet again demonstrated by the last congresses of the fraternal socialist countries' Communist and workers' parties, this drive has their full support. "Our Party accords immense significance to strengthening co-operation between the socialist states," declared First Secretary of the CC of the Polish United Workers' Party Edward Gierek. "The economic co-operation which we are furthering in the course of carrying out the programme for the socialist economic integration of the CMEA countries is making the socio-economic development of each of them

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 39.

easier and speeding it up. The Warsaw Treaty countries' political and defence union, by ensuring the security of our peoples, has, at the same time, become the basis for further activities directed towards detente and expanding peaceful relations between states with differing social systems."

Socialism was born in 1917 with the word "Peace" on its lips, carried this word along with it throughout its existence, and today is at the vanguard of mankind's struggle for securing peace on earth.

A Task of the First Priority

What problem does the Soviet state consider as of prime importance, that its main foreign policy efforts should now be aimed at solving?

The central place in the programme of further struggle for peace and international co-operation promulgated by the 25th Party Congress is given to questions concerning the struggle to end the dangerous arms race and the transition to reducing arms stockpiles and to disarmament. This is a whole complex of measures that continues the Peace Programme put forward by the 24th Congress of the CPSU. Why, in fact, has the first place been given to the tasks of disarmament?

The Russian word for "detente" is "*razryadka*", the literal meaning of which is "the action of unloading a weapon". It is quite obvious that no profound or long-lasting detente will be possible if the arms race is not stopped, since the threat of armed confrontation which the arms race involves looms permanently over peaceful coexistence.

Over the ages the majority of states have been guided in defence matters by the Latin proverb "*Si vis pacem, para bellum*"—"If you wish peace, prepare for war". The political concept according to which peace can only be kept by force, that is to say by means of an arms race, has done irreversible damage to human civilisation. Stockpiled

cannons have invariably "begun to speak"; as a result mankind has been through over 14,000 large and small wars in which nearly 4,000 million human lives—or approximately the whole population of the world today—have been lost. In the two world wars unleashed by imperialism in this century over 60 million people were killed and another 110 million made cripples.

It is hard to imagine the scale of the material damage done to mankind by wars and by the arms race. In the Soviet Union, which suffered the greatest losses during the last war, the fascists destroyed 1,710 towns, burnt 72,000 villages, and reduced 32,000 factories to rubble.

The figures show that military expenditures are no less in peacetime than they are during wars. Excluding the cost of the two world wars, mankind has spent 7,500 billion dollars (in 1975 prices) since 1900 on armaments. The ruinous arms race has accelerated to unprecedented levels in the last thirty years. Military expenditures worldwide are now twice what they were in 1950. Approximately 7,000 billion dollars have been spent on defence since the Second World War. Over half this sum was spent by the United States of America.

Lenin once said that disarmament is the ideal of socialism. Probably, no other state in the world has ever defended with such consistency and in so principled a way the idea of disarmament as the Soviet Union. Continuing this general line, the 24th Congress of the CPSU in 1971 proposed in its Peace Programme a wide range of concrete measures designed to slow down the arms race.

What has actually been done to achieve these aims in the first half of the 1970s?

The problem of disarmament was one of the central themes at all the meetings between the General Secretary of the CC CPSU and US Presidents. At the first such meeting in Moscow in May 1972 two important documents were signed: the Treaty Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the

Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and the Interim Agreement Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms. These two agreements for the first time set limits to the race in the most modern type of weapon—ballistic missiles.

The following year, during Leonid Brezhnev's visit to the United States, yet another document of immense importance was signed. This was the Agreement Between the USSR and the USA on the Prevention of Nuclear War. For more than a quarter century, from the time when American atomic bombs were dropped on two cities in Japan in 1945, killing hundreds of thousands of people, the black shadow of a possible nuclear war had hung over the world. And then the leaders of the two great powers possessing by far the greatest share of the world's nuclear stockpiles set their signatures to an obligation to do all that was in their power to prevent nuclear war.

Let us recall that Article I of the Soviet-American Agreement states that it is the aim of the USSR's and the USA's policy to eliminate the danger of nuclear war and of the use of nuclear weapons and that "accordingly, the Parties agree that they will act in such a manner as to prevent the development of situations capable of causing a dangerous exacerbation of their relations, as to avoid military confrontations, and as to exclude the outbreak of nuclear war between them and between either of the Parties and other countries". In the following articles the USSR and the USA undertake to refrain from threatening to use or using force against the other party, its allies, or third countries and to hold urgent consultations in the case of there being a risk of nuclear conflict in order to prevent it.

The Soviet-American Agreement met with a wide response on every continent: it was warmly welcomed by all peace-loving forces and by the majority of politicians, with the exception of the most aggressive circles in the West and also of Peking's propagandists with

their false thesis of a "nuclear plot between the super-powers".

Leonid Brezhnev's November 1974 meeting with US President Ford in Vladivostok resulted in further progress along the main trend of Soviet-American negotiations—the question of limiting strategic offensive arms. Noting the value of the previous agreements in this field, the two leaders agreed to complete, before the expiry of the Interim Agreement Between the USSR and the USA on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, the elaboration of a new agreement that would last until the end of 1985. It was especially stipulated that the new agreement would be based on the principle of equality and equal security and that both sides would have the right to possess a certain total quantity (2,400 units each) of strategic weapons carriers, that is to say intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-borne ballistic missiles and strategic bombers, including 1,320 missiles with multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles (MIRVs) each.

What did this agreement really amount to? It outlined, not just for a few years, but for more than a decade, a programme to lead our countries to a halt in the race in the most dangerous and expensive strategic weapons. Furthermore, the joint communiqué signed in Vladivostok by Leonid Brezhnev and Gerald Ford provided for negotiations to start not later than 1980-1981 on further arms limitations and a possible reduction of strategic weapons after 1985.

The news of the results achieved at the Vladivostok meeting was met with great satisfaction in the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries, as well as by the general public worldwide. In Washington the White House declared that the USA had achieved the most important agreement with the Russians since the Second World War.

Even a bald list of the treaties and agreements concluded between the USSR and the USA demonstrates how much

work has been done by our two countries in that most difficult sphere of international relations—slowing down the arms race—in the first half of the 1970s.

And although the main burden of this work, for understandable reasons, falls on the shoulders of the Soviet Union and the United States, this field is not, of course, their monopoly: many other states are concerned about it and actively involved in it.

Other important negotiations have been or are being held: negotiations are taking place in Vienna on mutual troops and armaments reductions in Central Europe; in Geneva one of the bodies of the European Conference has worked out certain concrete steps to be taken in order to achieve military detente (I have already mentioned that an agreement was achieved on giving advance warning of military manoeuvres, and so on); and the Committee on Disarmament holds regular sittings in Geneva as well.

It is true that these negotiations do not always proceed smoothly and that they usually involve a long-drawn-out diplomatic struggle. This is understandable, since they are dealing with extremely important questions to do with the defence of states. The Vienna talks, for example, in which the Warsaw Treaty states, on the one hand, and the Western countries, on the other, have for several years already been struggling over precisely what troops and what types of weapon should be reduced in Central Europe, over what period, and so on are not proving to be easy.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are working hard for disarmament within the framework of the United Nations. The socialist countries have put forward a whole series of concrete proposals and many of these have formed the basis of important UN resolutions. The agenda of the 31st General Assembly (1976) included about 20 questions connected with disarmament and many of these were proposed by the socialist countries.

At the same time, it should be recognised that all that has been done up to now in the field of disarmament constitutes only the first few steps. In fact, mankind has not

yet managed to stop the arms race or even to slow it down to any considerable extent. Mankind yearly wastes the astronomical sum of 300,000 million dollars on the arms race. Each year sees the creation of ever more destructive weapons and the growth of total stockpiles.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly pointed out to other countries and to the world public that this state of affairs—the development of political detente combined with a continuation of the arms race—cannot go on forever. The Soviet Union considers that the problem of disarmament and of the addition of military detente to political detente should now be the central question in international politics. This call of the times is now becoming real given the present conditions in the international arena. This is testified to, in particular, by the results of the European Conference in Helsinki at which the majority of participants unequivocally expressed themselves in favour of this. Speaking about the most vitally urgent tasks to be dealt with after the European Conference, Leonid Brezhnev emphasised in his speech in Helsinki that “uppermost in our mind is the task of ending the arms race and achieving tangible results in disarmament”.*

It was on this basis that the Soviet Union advanced at the 25th Congress of the CPSU in early 1976 new and wide-ranging tasks and concrete proposals designed to promote arms limitations and disarmament.

The USSR's final aim in this field was and remains universal total disarmament. At the same time, Soviet diplomacy is doing all it possibly can to achieve progress on individual sections of the path leading to this target.

In brief, the complex of tasks in the field of disarmament advanced within the framework of the foreign policy programme of the 25th Congress of the CPSU includes the following:

—to achieve the conclusion of a new agreement between the USSR and the USA on the limitation of and reductions

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 580.

in strategic weapons together with international treaties on the universal and total prohibition of atomic weapons tests, on the prohibition and destruction of chemical warfare weapons, on prohibiting the design of new forms and systems of mass destruction weapons, and also the manipulation of the environment for military and other hostile purposes;

- to activate the Vienna negotiations on troops and arms reductions in Central Europe and after the first steps have been taken in this direction to continue to work for military detente in that area;

- to achieve the transition to a systematic reduction in military expenditures;

- to take steps to ensure that a World Disarmament Conference is called as soon as possible.

The above is the Soviet state's programme of struggle for peace and international security in the area that is most important today.

How much lies behind each line of this programme: It is logical that the first place in it should be occupied by the task of *concluding* a new agreement between the USSR and the USA on the limitation of and reductions in strategic offensive weapons. It is no secret that the Soviet Union and the United States together possess by far the greatest stocks of atomic weapons and of the means for delivering them. The active negotiations between the two countries (especially in 1972-1975), the Soviet-American treaties and agreements signed in those years, and the agreement in principle to hold further negotiations achieved by the General Secretary of the CC CPSU and the US President in late 1974 in Vladivostok have altogether created a solid basis for further and more decisive advances in the matter of slowing down the arms race.

The world public expected that after the "dead season" in these negotiations caused by the US presidential elections the new Washington Administration would move on to take serious and concrete steps in this direction. Against all expectations, however, US Secretary of State Cyrus

Vance's visit to Moscow in late March 1977 showed that the American side had set off in another direction. The proposals brought by Vance constituted to all intents and purposes an attempt to revise the Vladivostok agreement and to achieve unilateral advantages for the USA to the detriment of the Soviet Union's security. The propagandistic hue and cry following Vance's visit about the United States having supposedly put forward a "global disarmament programme" and Moscow having refused it gave good grounds to think that Washington was in fact striving not for progress in its negotiations with the USSR, but only for political gain. The Soviet Union, naturally, could not allow such a revision of the Vladivostok agreement, because it was damaging to its national security and constituted a dirty propaganda trick. The USSR insists that negotiations continue precisely on the basis of the Vladivostok agreement and such negotiations are now taking place. Moreover, the Soviet Union considers that after what was agreed on in Vladivostok is achieved, the USSR and the USA could go further. It is well known, for example, that the Soviet Union has proposed that the two countries mutually abandon their plans to create the new generation of Trident atomic-powered submarines and B-1 heavy bombers and the corresponding Soviet submarines and bombers. Should the Soviet proposals be accepted the two countries would be able to economise thousands of millions of dollars and roubles, thus avoiding a new climb up the spiral of the arms race.

It is on the USA and the USSR that the implementation of the many proposals made concerning disarmament also most depends. These we examine below.

* * *

While the above most important problem of slowing down the strategic arms race is the business of the leading military powers—the USSR and the USA—although it is, of

course, of immense significance for the whole of mankind, many other tasks to do with stopping the arms and achieving disarmament are posed at the United Nations. At the 31st General Assembly (1976) the Soviet Union contributed a unique document: its Memorandum on Questions of Ending the Arms Race and Disarmament. This analyses the state of affairs in each branch of disarmament and describes the USSR's action programme and aims in this field. What are these aims?

Given that nuclear weapons present the greatest danger to mankind, the most important measure is to achieve *total nuclear disarmament*. The Soviet Union has always spoken out in favour of the prohibition of nuclear weapons, in favour of their exclusion from the arsenals of every state. As early as 1946 the USSR proposed that all nuclear weapons be destroyed and forbidden. Then and later, when the stockpiles of such weapons were still not very large, it would have been much simpler to reach an agreement on prohibiting and destroying them. This task has now become much more complicated, because nuclear weapons have grown into a vast variety of types and systems and immense stocks of them have been made. The Soviet Union considers, however, that this task can be solved even in the present-day conditions.

To achieve this it is above all necessary for the nuclear arms race to be stopped, that is to say, for an end to be put to the production of nuclear weapons, and to the design and building of new types of bomb. It is also necessary to begin reducing current nuclear weapons stockpiles by using the fissionable materials in them in peaceful branches of the economy. The final aim of this reduction should be the total liquidation of all types of nuclear weapon, both strategic and tactical, both offensive and defensive.

For one state possessing nuclear weapons to set about liquidating its stocks, while at the same time others continue to increase their arsenals is, obviously, out of the question. This means that all the nuclear powers must take

part simultaneously in nuclear disarmament. The Soviet Union has repeatedly announced its readiness at any time to start negotiations on these all-important questions with the other nuclear powers and does not object to the participation in these negotiations of the non-nuclear powers as well, since all the nations of the world stand to gain from them.

General Secretary of the CC CPSU and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Leonid Brezhnev in his report on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution put forward a new and far-reaching proposal in this field, declaring that "*today we are proposing a radical step: that agreement be reached on a simultaneous halt in the production of nuclear weapons by all states.* This would apply to all such weapons—whether atomic, hydrogen, or neutron bombs or projectiles. At the same time, the nuclear powers could undertake to make a start on the gradual reduction of existing stockpiles of such weapons, and move towards their complete, total destruction. The energy of the atom for peaceful purposes exclusively—this is the call issued by the Soviet state, in the year of its sixtieth anniversary, to the governments and peoples of the world".

The Soviet Union's final aim in this matter is to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war. To add to the agreements on preventing the accidental or unsanctioned outbreak of nuclear war already signed between the Soviet Union and the USA, Great Britain, and France, the USSR proposed in the autumn of 1977 at the 32nd UN General Assembly a draft resolution on the prevention of nuclear war involving the following measures: restraint by the nuclear powers, the avoidance of confrontations, the conclusion between all the nuclear powers of accords to prevent the accidental or unsanctioned use of nuclear weapons, the conclusion of an agreement to withdraw nuclear-weapons-bearing ships from certain regions of the world's seas, and the association of all states which have not yet done so to the treaties concerning the non-use of nuclear weapons in the

specified spheres, and so on. All these proposals are right now being examined by the UN.

The most important question in this complex and one on which putting a stop on the arms race in many ways depends is the *prohibition of all nuclear weapons tests*. Such a measure would put an end to the making of qualitative improvements to nuclear weapons and would prevent the design of new types.

It should be said that certain achievements have been made in this direction. The 1963 Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Under Water restricted the sphere of possible nuclear tests and eliminated a dangerous source of radioactive pollution of the environment. Over 100 states have at present signed this treaty.

The task, however, has not been fully solved: firstly, not all the nuclear powers have as yet signed it (the exceptions being China and France; in fact, the former is to this day continuing to carry out nuclear test explosions in the atmosphere), and secondly, underground nuclear tests were not prohibited by it.

A new step was made in 1974 when the USSR and the USA signed the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests of a power of more than 150 kilotons. This treaty still further narrowed the possibilities for designing and building the most powerful and, therefore, most dangerous types of nuclear weapon and also restricted possible tests to a minimum.

Despite all this it has not as yet proved possible to solve the problem of putting a complete stop to nuclear tests. There still remains the urgent task of achieving an international agreement on the prohibition of absolutely all nuclear weapons tests for absolutely all states. The conditions for this were to all intents and purposes reached as a result of the conclusion in 1975 of the Treaty Between the USSR and the USA on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes. This treaty established norms for the carrying out of peaceful explosions that would

exclude the possibility of using them to improve nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union in 1975 laid before the United Nations a Draft of the Treaty on the Complete and General Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons Tests. The Soviet draft treaty is worded in such a way that while outlawing all nuclear weapons tests it, at the same time, does not prohibit countries, whether they do or do not possess nuclear weapons, from using atomic power for peaceful purposes.

The Soviet initiative was widely supported and at the 30th General Assembly the delegations of 94 countries voted for it. The General Assembly called on all the states possessing nuclear weapons to enter into negotiations (in which the non-nuclear states, too, could join) in order to achieve an agreement on this question. However, as a result of the negative position taken by certain nuclear powers, these negotiations have not as yet begun.

In this situation the Soviet Union has once again come out in favour of totally prohibiting nuclear weapons tests so that these may be banned not only in the atmosphere, in space, and under water, but also underground. The Soviet Government has declared its readiness to conclude agreements on the declaration of a moratorium on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes along with the prohibition of all nuclear weapons tests for a specified period. This important step by the USSR was widely approved and should clear the way to the conclusion of a treaty that mankind has long aspired to.

One other important task is closely connected to the problem described above: this is the problem of avoiding the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is quite obvious that the danger of nuclear war would grow immeasurably if states that do not at present possess nuclear weapons become involved in the process of building and stockpiling them. The most important part in this matter is played by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons which has been in force since the late 1960s and of which over 100 states are today signatories. The

nuclear powers that have signed this treaty have engaged themselves not to hand over any nuclear weapon or any other explosive nuclear device to anyone whomsoever, while the states that do not possess nuclear weapons have engaged themselves not to produce and not to acquire such weapons or any nuclear devices. It is important that this treaty's coverage has now grown wider—a number of large states, including the FRG and Italy, have joined it. On the other hand, however, two (of the five) nuclear states—China and France—have not signed it. Certain non-nuclear states whose industrial and technological level of development is such that they could build their own nuclear weapons (these are called “near-nuclear states”) have also declined to sign this treaty. These are the Republic of South Africa, Israel, Brazil, Argentina, and a number of other states.

A further threat is resulting from the fact that the commercial interests of certain Western countries sometimes prevail over political good sense. What I am referring to here is the nuclear export that is now growing so rapidly. The export of atomic equipment and materials is sometimes so great that the countries receiving them could set about producing their own nuclear weapons. Thus, in 1975 the FRG concluded an agreement about the construction in Brazil of eight major atomic power stations with an output capacity of 1,300,000 kilowatts each, and also of plants to enrich uranium and process radioactive fuel (this contract was worth 4,000 million dollars). In early 1976 France and Pakistan signed an agreement about the construction in Pakistan of a plant to process radioactive fuel (this deal was worth 150 million dollars). In May 1976 France concluded a contract to sell the Republic of South Africa a one-million kilowatt atomic power station. This decision caused a wave of protests worldwide, especially in Africa. The press also reported plans by the Western powers to build atomic power stations in Iran and in other countries and to supply them with nuclear equipment.

It should furthermore be kept in mind that plutonium, a fissionable material from which nuclear weapons can be made, is a by-product of the running of atomic power stations. Quite a few countries are already now producing plutonium in quantities sufficient to enable them to make their own atomic bombs; the nuclear export described above is increasing the number of these countries still further.

It is not difficult to imagine the danger that lies behind the prospect of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the fact that such weapons could now be made in various parts of the world. Two examples will suffice here: Israel and Egypt, between whom armed conflicts that endangered universal peace have on more than one occasion flared up, have not signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Who knows what might happen if these two countries possess nuclear weapons the next time there is a conflict between them? And what would the potential threat be if the racist Republic of South Africa came into possession of nuclear weapons?

The task of strengthening the regime whereby nuclear weapons do not proliferate is, therefore, exceptionally topical and occupies an important place in the Soviet programme of struggle for nuclear disarmament.

The Soviet Union is exerting every effort to ensure that this and the other nuclear disarmament tasks enumerated above are solved in the interests of mankind as rapidly as possible.

* * *

Another urgent problem is the matter of *prohibiting and ensuring the destruction of chemical weapons*. Such weapons attack only living things and making use of them has always aroused the indignation of all peoples. Poisonous gases were used on a massive scale for the first time during the First World War—over a million soldiers were affected by them and 100,000 died. Military technology

in this field, too, has advanced greatly since then. A group of specialists prepared a report for the United Nations in which it was stated that the use of chemical weapons on a large scale would lead not only to the deaths of a vast number of people, but would also have irreversible consequences on the human environment.

It will be remembered that the Geneva protocol of 1925 prohibited the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous, and other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare. It did not, however, prohibit and, therefore, did not prevent continued research into chemical weapons and the stockpiling of these. In 1975 there came into force an international Convention worked out on the basis of a draft presented by the USSR and the other socialist countries—On the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and Their Destruction. This constituted the first step towards true disarmament since it removed one of the types of mass annihilation weapon from the military arsenals of states. This convention was heartily approved by all peoples. It too, however, did not forbid chemical weapons. The Soviet Union's proposals on this matter were for a long time resisted by the Western powers. Furthermore, during the war in Vietnam the American army made considerable use of herbicides, defoliants, and various gases and poured over 90,000 tons of chemicals down onto the country, killing a large number of people and doing a vast damage to Vietnam's natural environment.

The reports that periodically appear in the press about the continuing modernisation of chemical weapons in some countries confirm the urgency of the task of prohibiting them. It has recently been reported, for example, that psycho-chemicals that attack the function of the human brain have been tested. The drug LSD, which the Americans have experimented with, is so toxin that one kilogramme of the substance is enough for tens of thousands of doses, each capable of doing considerable damage to a man's mind. There also exists a danger not only that chemical

weapons will be qualitatively improved, but that they, too, will proliferate quantitatively, ever more countries including them in their arsenals.

With all this in mind, the Soviet Union is working for the soonest possible transition of the long-drawn-out negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons from their preparatory stage of technical research to the practical plane of working out a corresponding international agreement. This task is posed as one of the main ones in the Memorandum of the Soviet Union on Questions of Ending the Arms Race and of Disarmament that was discussed at the 31st General Assembly. The General Assembly passed a special resolution in which it called insistently on all countries to strive to reach an agreement that would effectively prohibit work on and the production and stockpiling of all types of chemical weapon and lead to their destruction. Talks are now being held at the Geneva Committee on Disarmament about these chemical weapons and it is in the interests of all states that they should be completed as soon as possible.

* * *

The prohibition of the design of new types of weapon and mass annihilation weapons systems holds an important place in the programme of struggle for disarmament approved by the 25th Congress of the CPSU. The fact is that scientific and technological progress means that new types of weapon comparable in destructiveness to nuclear, chemical, or bacteriological weapons or even more powerful than they may appear in the foreseeable future. There is a very great danger that this may happen and a way to prevent it must be found. It is easier to agree to prevent the appearance of one or other type of weapon than to remove already existing and stockpiled weapons from arsenals.

It is precisely on the basis of this idea that the Soviet Union put forward in 1975 a proposal that an internation-

al agreement which would prevent the design and production of new types of mass annihilation weapon and weapons systems be concluded. Negotiations are already being held on this matter and during them it has become clear that a more accurate description of the new forms and types of weapon to be prohibited was desirable.

The Soviet Union is prepared to place in this category any type of weapon that is based on qualitatively new principles—either in the way it is applied, in the things it attacks, or in the nature of its effects. We could, for instance, be speaking here of radiation weapons that can affect the blood or endocellular plasma; infrasound weapons designed to have a harmful effect on the body's internal organs or to affect behaviour; and genetic weapons the use of which would disrupt the genetic inheritance mechanism. As science develops, it is possible that even more dangerous weapons may appear, that unexpected twists the consequences of which are hard to foresee may take place. In the Soviet Union's opinion, it ought also to be agreed to prohibit the building of any new mass annihilation systems such as, for example, rocket-borne nuclear weapons systems designed to be delivered from outer space. At the 31st General Assembly 120 states voted in favour of the Soviet proposal on prohibiting the design and construction of new mass annihilation weapons and weapons systems. The General Assembly called upon the Committee on Disarmament to speed up its negotiations for a draft agreement on this question and to present a report on the matter at the next, 32nd, General Assembly. The successful completion of these negotiations and the conclusion of an agreement on the matter would bar the way to a new, dangerous, and expensive leg in the arms race.

* * *

Much has recently been said about the need to *prohibit interference with the environment for military and other hostile purposes* and this task also figures in the

foreign policy programme of the 25th Congress of the CPSU.

Man has always wanted to learn how to control nature. The present-day stage of scientific and technological progress is bringing this possibility closer. Experience has already been accumulated in struggling against drought by means of artificially inducing rain, in preventing hailstorms, and even in changing the path of hurricanes. Besides actively interfering with certain local climatic phenomena, work aimed at changing the earth's climate, at taming volcanic eruptions, at preventing earthquakes, and so on is going to be performed on an ever increasing scale in the future.

Interfering with the environment can, however, be used not only for peaceful purposes, but also for destructive and military ends. The American army in Vietnam, as I said above, subjected over 58,000 square kilometres of land to treatment with chemicals. The chemicals used totally destroyed plant life and in some cases it has proved impossible to restore it. The value of the damage done is estimated at about 500 million dollars.

Also in Vietnam the Americans artificially induced intense rainfalls in order to destroy roads, cause landslides, flood certain districts, cause fords to be washed away, and so on. The Americans viewed Vietnam as a testing ground and also experimented with causing "firestorms", reducing vast areas of jungle to ashes.

It would also be possible to interfere with the environment on a global scale with even more terrible consequences. For example, a group of American scientists reported to a Senate commission that it would be possible to destroy in the upper atmosphere the ozone layer that protects the surface of our planet from the sun's deadly ultra-violet rays over a given area of the earth. The effect of these rays on striking the area in question would be to kill all living things and plant life there, turning it into a burnt-out desert.

The following should also on principle be possible: to heat the Arctic's and the Antarctic's ices and add a part of their water to the ocean, thereby causing tidal waves of incredible strength that would strike the coastal zones of many countries and wash away everything in their path. The power of the phenomena we are speaking of should be kept in mind: the energy of cyclones, for example, is measured in units equivalent to the power let loose by thousands of megatons of TNT.

The reader may, perhaps, think that the above examples are too "fantastic". Soviet experts, however, say, "No, they are not fantastic." It would not even require the application of very great energies to bring such terrible natural forces into motion. Natural processes are sometimes internally so unstable that even a relatively small artificial push would be enough to start a chain reaction. One example: one only needs to seed a cloud with a volume of thousands of cubic kilometres with a few kilos of silver iodide crystals in order to change its state.

The prospect of "geophysical weapons" being acquired by the enemies of peace and used by them to open a new area of the arms race is arousing great anxiety in the scientific community. In the USA the National Academy of Sciences and the American Meteorological Society have addressed a call to their government asking it to work for the prohibition of interference with the environment for military purposes. The UN Conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm in 1972 passed a recommendation that no country should endeavour to damage the environment of another state.

The question of interfering with the environment for military purposes was discussed at the summer 1974 Soviet-American summit meeting and both sides at that time expressed themselves in favour of effective measures being taken in this field.

In 1974 the Soviet Union presented before the UN its proposal for a convention on this question. The UN General Assembly approved this Soviet initiative by an over-

whelming majority of votes and called for a draft convention to be drawn up. This was done after consultations between the USSR's and the USA's representatives and additions were then made to it by other states at the Geneva Committee on Disarmament. The 31st General Assembly approved the draft convention and recommended that all states sign it. The convention prohibiting alterations of the environment for military or any other hostile purposes was signed in 1977 in Geneva first by the representatives of 33 states, including the USSR and the USA, and then by a number of other countries. The convention says that each signatory state has undertaken not to have recourse to any means of interfering with the environment for military or any other hostile purposes that might have far-ranging, long-term, or serious consequences because of destruction caused in or damage done to another state. The convention also forbids giving aid in activities of this kind to any other state. The convention finally lists the types of activity included under this prohibition: causing disturbances of the ecological balance and interfering with the processes taking place beneath the earth, in the atmosphere, and in the seas and oceans. The convention, at the same time, in no way restricts work of a peaceful nature on changing the environment.

The signing of this important convention has closed yet another branch of the arms race, one that was an extraordinary threat to mankind's very existence.

* * *

In one of his speeches, General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev once said that to defuse the powder keg or rather the nuclear keg that Europe has been turned into would be no easy task, but that it was important to start making a real move in that direction.

That is why the foreign policy programme approved by the 25th Congress of the CPSU set the following task: *to activise the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces*

and armaments in Central Europe and after the first steps have been taken in this direction to continue to work for military detente in that region.

These important negotiations have been going on for over four years now in Vienna's Hofburg Palace. And it should be said quite frankly that the results attained so far are not very comforting. The socialist countries' delegations have put forward a large number of proposals in Vienna, but these have not been accepted by the West. That was the case with the socialist countries' proposal that the number of troops maintained and arms held by the direct participants in the talks be reduced by more than 15 per cent over a three-year period. That was the case in 1976 when the socialist states, meeting their Western interlocutors halfway, agreed to carry out the troop reductions in two stages: at the first, in 1976, to reduce the number of Warsaw Treaty and NATO armed forces by an equal percentage and to withdraw a given quantity of arms and military equipment, including nuclear weapons, belonging to the Soviet Union and the United States; and at the second, in 1977-1978, to reduce the quantity of troops and weapons maintained by the other direct participants—both socialist and capitalist—in the talks.

The Western participants, however, are proposing a plan according to which the Soviet Union would have to withdraw three times as many soldiers as the United States; furthermore, they refuse to undertake in advance to carry out the withdrawal of troops and armaments of the other countries involved when the time comes for the second stage. In brief, they are, obviously, striving for a change in the balance of power in Europe that is militarily advantageous to NATO and detrimental to the socialist states' security. This unrealistic position is the real factor slowing down the progress of the Vienna talks.

The Soviet Union sincerely hopes that the Western participants in the negotiations will at last show a realistic approach to this urgent problem. For its part, it will continue as ever to work actively for the soonest possible

solution of this problem in the interests of the European peoples.

* * *

Of the many ways to put a stop to the arms race, one of the most direct and effective is to *cut back on military budgets*. This task, too, is clearly formulated in the resolutions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU.

The Soviet Union has for a long time already made it clear that it would agree to practical steps in this field. As early as the late 1950s-early 1960s it expressed its readiness to implement jointly with the USA, Great Britain, and France either a freeze or a reduction of between 10 and 15 per cent in military budgets. The USSR at that time unilaterally, to break the ice, as it were, carried out a reduction of its armed forces.

In 1973 the Soviet Union placed before the UN a proposal that the military budgets of the states permanently on the UN Security Council be reduced by 10 per cent and that part of the money thus saved be used to help the developing countries. It also proposed that other states with large economic and military potentials join in this move. Calculations made at the time showed that the extra aid to the developing countries to be paid through the offices of the UN would be in the order of 1,500 million dollars.

Regrettably, due to the position taken by certain states with large military budgets and above all by the members of NATO, no move has to this day been made in this direction. Meanwhile, their military budgets are constantly being increased. Thus, in the USA 73.7 billion dollars were allocated for military needs in the 1973/1974 financial year, while in 1976/1977 this figure soared up to 113 billion dollars and in 1978/1979 to 126 billion dollars. The FRG's military budget for 1976 was up 80 per cent over the figure for 1971. The same trend is to be seen in Britain, the Netherlands, and the other Western countries.

The Soviet Union is the only one of all the great powers that is not increasing its military expenditures, but,

on the contrary, reducing them with every passing year. In 1973 these amounted to 17.9 billion roubles, while in 1977 they were down to 17.2 billion roubles.

The Memorandum on disarmament the Soviet Union presented to the UN in 1976 again pointed out the need to reduce military budgets and to implement the Soviet Union's earlier proposal concerning a 10 per cent cut in the military budgets of the permanent members of the UN Security Council in order to use a part of the money thus saved to help the developing countries. On this occasion, the USSR declared that it was prepared to take a flexible attitude as regards the actual size of the initial cutbacks: these could be of either more or less than 10 per cent and the reduction could start as early as 1977. It was important to get this question together with the whole problem of reducing military budgets in gear as soon as possible and to make a real start down the road to disarmament.

* * *

The directions proposed by the Soviet Union in the field of disarmament also include such measures as *reducing armed forces and conventional weapons* (i.e., military aircraft, artillery, tanks, and so on), *dismantling foreign military bases on the territory of third countries*, and *the creation of zones of peace* (in particular in the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean) *and of non-nuclear zones*.

Some success has already been achieved in the matter of creating zones that are free of nuclear weapons. Thus, a treaty concluded in 1959 turned the vast Antarctic continent into a demilitarised zone to which it is also forbidden to take nuclear weapons. Space together with the Moon and other planets has practically been made into an infinite non-nuclear zone: an international agreement prohibiting the launching into space of mass annihilation weapons or the orbiting of craft with the same on board has been in effect since 1967. Military use of sea-bed and ocean-floor has been forbidden since 1971.

All these measures, however, concern, as can easily be seen, only those fields in which human activity, at least for the time being, has been carried out on a small scale. The task of making inhabited parts of our planet into non-nuclear zones remains unsolved. The Soviet Union supports the proposal that such zones be set up in Northern Europe, in Africa, and in the Middle East. The USSR has repeatedly declared that it never had and does not now have the intention of building military bases in the Indian Ocean. The USSR's proposal that all Soviet and American ships and submarines carrying nuclear weapons be withdrawn from the Mediterranean is still operative.

Not allowing given regions to become involved in a destructive arms race, especially nuclear, is another important trend in the development of detente and the Soviet Union intends to do all that is in its power to promote this.

All these questions are in one way or another being examined at various negotiations, be they bilateral, regional, or within the framework of the UN. At the same time, the achievement of cardinal shifts towards solving the problem of disarmament, a problem that concerns all states without exception, requires that this problem be considered by an international forum that is as wide and as authoritative as possible. The *World Disarmament Conference* should, in the Soviet Union's opinion, be that forum and the USSR has been working hard for it to be called.

The special session of the UN General Assembly convened in May-June 1977 in New York was also a useful forum. The Soviet Union took an active part in the preparations for and the running of this special session as it considered it to be a step towards the calling of the World Disarmament Conference. The Soviet Union's main aim in this matter was to attract the attention of all nations to the need to solve today's most pressing problem—the problem of stopping the arms race and of disarmament—because this problem vitally concerns the whole of mankind and each one of us individually.

One other important task, in fact, is bound up with the problem of disarmament. This was outlined in general terms as early as in the 24th CPSU Congress' Peace Programme. I am referring to the principle of refraining from the threat or use of force in solving international disputes being put into the form of a universal treaty. This principle has already been included in a number of important bilateral and international documents, in particular in the Principles of Co-operation Between the USSR and France, the Treaty on the Basic Principles of Mutual Relations Between the USSR and the USA, and others. It is also to be found in the UN Charter and in the Final Act of the European Conference in Helsinki. Speaking at the 25th Congress of the CPSU General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev proposed that a *world treaty on non-use of force in international relations* be concluded. Its signatories, including, of course, the nuclear powers, would engage themselves to refrain from using any kind of weapon, nuclear weapons included, in solving disputes between one another. The conclusion of such a treaty—and a draft for one was officially put before the 31st General Assembly by the Soviet Union—would reduce the danger of war still further and would create conditions favouring progress towards disarmament. The beneficial influence the conclusion of such a universal treaty would have on the moral and political situation over the world practically defies description.

* * *

I have described the Soviet programme of struggle for putting a stop to the arms race and for disarmament in such detail, because this is, without a doubt, the most vital problem in present-day international relations. According to the UN figures, the nuclear powers' arsenals now contain over a million times as much explosive power as that of the bomb the Americans dropped on Hiroshima in 1945. Mankind is tired of sitting on a powder keg, on a mountain of weapons. There is now (in terms of TNT) 15 tons of explo-

sives per inhabitant of our planet, including babies still at the breast. Is it, therefore, not time for mankind to pause to think and to put a stop to the arms race which is endangering its very existence? It is indeed! And that is what the Soviet Union is trying to do. Over the last decades the USSR has put forward a total of about 70 proposals on questions concerning disarmament and strengthening international security. Our country is still today in the vanguard of the struggle for peace, for unsullied skies over our planet.

Implementing the Helsinki Agreements

The significance of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the attitude of various states to the implementation of the agreements contained in its Final Act has been one of the central questions of international life over the last two years. The Soviet Union's position on these matters is absolutely clear: we consider this conference, for the convening of which we worked for so long, to have been an outstanding event in the life of Europe—and not only of that continent—and we could not be more serious about honestly implementing our undertaking to fulfil its resolutions. The point was made at the 25th Congress of the CPSU that strengthening security and increasing co-operation in Europe is one of the main tasks of the USSR's foreign policies in the forthcoming years.

Sufficient time has passed since that memorable day when the leaders of 33 European states and of the USA and Canada all sitting at one table signed the Final Act of the European Conference. Since then there has hardly been a day in which the results of this historic meeting or various points from its Final Act have not been brought up in one way or another in the speeches of public figures and politicians from the participant countries, at various negotiations, or in press commentaries—and this not only in Europe. The first all-European meeting since Helsinki has

taken place in Belgrade. Furthermore, it is natural that the results of the Helsinki Conference should be viewed today in the main through the prism of the practical implementation of the understandings reached and their real influence on international affairs.

What, from this point of view, is the main and most decisive thing in the Final Act? "The Conference's Final Act," said General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev, "is a rich, multifaceted code for peaceful association and co-operation among states. We are striving to implement all its provisions. But what we value most highly is that this document is directed at achieving a lasting peace in Europe. That was the main goal of the European Conference—to help strengthen the peace and security of the European nations."*

The Soviet Union's foreign policy activities are all dedicated to achieving this main aim. The USSR sees it as a primary task to implant the Final Act's political principles deeply in international relations, especially such points as the inviolability of frontiers, non-interference in the internal affairs of other peoples, the sovereign equality of states, and so on. It is quite obvious that only keeping strictly to these principles, which in their totality make up a solid political, legal, and moral basis for the relations between the participant states, can the process of detente continue successfully in Europe, and co-operation in the concrete fields envisaged in the Final Act develop. Co-operation of this kind is possible on no other basis. This is the view of all the socialist countries that participated in the European Conference, a view that was abundantly clear at all the bilateral and multilateral meetings held between the party and state leaders of the socialist community countries since Helsinki.

The Soviet leadership has since Helsinki also entered into many negotiations with the heads of state, government

* *For Peace, Security, Co-operation and Social Progress in Europe*, Berlin, 29-30 June 1976, p. 6.

leaders, and the ministers of foreign affairs of various capitalist states—France, Portugal, the FRG, Italy, Finland, Turkey, Great Britain, Sweden, Denmark, and Belgium. At all these meetings the Soviet side raised the question of the need to consolidate the political results of the European Conference, strove to have undertakings to fulfil the Helsinki understandings included in final documents, agreements, and communiqués, and put forward concrete proposals for the development of co-operation in the fields mentioned in the Final Act.

The practice of holding interstate political consultations and meetings has grown notably more frequent in Europe over the recent years, while ever more concrete agreements are being concluded and questions concerning the implementation of the Final Act's clauses have started to be discussed within international organisations such as the UN Economic Commission for Europe, UNESCO, and others. One of the most important understandings in that "first basket"—that concerning advance warnings of any large military manoeuvres and the invitation to them of foreign observers—is being fulfilled. Observers from a number of neighbouring countries were invited to the USSR to observe the Kavkaz and Sever manoeuvres. All in all, Helsinki's principles and understandings are entering step by step into Europe's daily life and this cannot but be grounds for satisfaction.

At the same time, there are still in the West today certain people who are trying to deny the obviously positive effects of all these factors on the situation in Europe. Those forces that previously wanted to torpedo the calling of the European Conference are now striving to discredit its results, to cast doubts on the socialist states' sincerity about following a policy of detente and co-operation, and to interfere in the internal affairs of other peoples. Certain politicians in the West are being inconsistent in their evaluation of the detente process and of the way the Helsinki resolutions are being implemented and are striving to twist their content in a manner "profitable" to them, but

to the detriment of the Final Act's main political content. It is clear that the process of consolidating security and increasing co-operation in Europe would go faster and be richer without these inconsistencies, if all states took an equally responsible approach to the matter of detente and the fulfilment of the European Conference's resolutions.

At the European Conference Leonid Brezhnev spoke convincingly about how the addition of military detente to political detente would be an important trend in consolidating the conference's results. Almost all the participants in the Helsinki meeting approved of the question being put in this way. How then do matters now stand in this? Since the European Conference, the Soviet Union, as has been mentioned above, has come forward at the UN with many important proposals for putting a stop to the arms race and beginning disarmament and has together with the other socialist countries offered new compromises at the ongoing Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

The Warsaw Treaty countries have addressed a call to all the states which signed the Final Act in Helsinki to undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other. Other concrete proposals in the spirit of the European Conference's resolutions for consolidating security in Europe have been made. These include the suggestion that an article to be found in both the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic Treaty which allows the circle of participants in these organisations to be enlarged by means of other states joining them, be simultaneously excluded from both treaties.

What was the Western countries' reply to these initiatives? The Warsaw Treaty countries' extremely important proposal concerning the non-use of nuclear weapons was hurriedly met with total hostility by NATO headquarters. The Soviet Union cut back its military budget in 1977 by 200 million roubles, while the members of NATO increased their military budgets by several thousand million dollars. The number of military manoeuvres held in Western

Europe in 1977 was nearly double that of the preceding year. And what about the mass pressure exerted on the new Washington Administration in late 1976-early 1977 with the aim of preventing a reduction in military allocations? The old "Soviet military threat" bugbear was dusted off once again and the absurd ideas that detente and the implementation of Helsinki's Final Act are "dangerous", since they "weaken" the West, induce the NATO countries to cut back their military expenditures and so on, were once again repeated.

If one examines the positions taken and, more importantly, the moves made by the socialist and capitalist countries in the matter of struggling for disarmament, it becomes perfectly clear that the West by no means deserves the highest marks. The Western participants in the European Conference are, obviously, not doing their bit and are evading their responsibility to consolidate and develop the spirit of Helsinki.

The questions of trade and economic and scientific and technological co-operation figured prominently at the European Conference. This is easy to understand if one recalls the scale of these contacts in Europe: two-thirds of the trade turnover between the socialist and capitalist worlds take place there. The trade turnover between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries of Europe has more than tripled in recent years, rising by 50 per cent in 1975-1977 alone. This figure, however, does not represent an upper limit. The economic potential of both of Europe's halves not only allows for, but insistently demands a considerable expansion of trade and economic co-operation between them in the future. The Soviet Union has signed many new agreements in this field since the European Conference and has also concluded 15 large product-pay-back deals with French, West German, American, Italian, and other firms. The publication of economic and commercial materials of interest to our partners has been increased in the USSR and the number of foreign firms and banks with offices in this country has gone up.

CMEA's proposal that an agreement be concluded between it and the Common Market on the bases for interrelations between them was designed to serve the further growth of mutually profitable trade and economic co-operation in Europe. The draft agreement sent by CMEA to the Common Market proposed that the two sides should in the spirit of Helsinki and on the basis of giving each other the most-favoured-nation treatment take all the necessary measures to promote the growth of trade between the two groups of countries. The ball is now in the Common Market's court.

Great interest was shown by Europe's public and business circles in yet another Soviet initiative: Leonid Brezhnev's proposal that European congresses or inter-governmental consultations be held on such questions as co-operation in the fields of environmental protection, the development of transport, and the power industry. It should be recalled at this point that precisely these spheres were listed in the Final Act at Helsinki as the most promising areas for co-operation in Europe.

Thus, in the field of trade and economic relations, too, the Soviet Union is in fact following the spirit and letter of the Final Act. We have every right to expect the same from our Western partners who still place, as is well known, a number of illogical restrictions on trade with the socialist countries: there are prohibitions in selling many types of equipment to the USSR, and import licenses for Soviet goods are often given reluctantly and with delays. The USA has to this day not abolished its discriminatory legislation on trade with the USSR and on the granting of credits to it. All in all, the West could if it so wished make a considerably greater contribution to the fulfilment of the trade and economic understandings to be found in the Final Act.

The Soviet Union is also doing a great deal in the matter of implementing the understandings reached in Helsinki on developing cultural co-operation, the exchange of information, and contacts between institutions and people.

The question of the implementation of these understandings has been used in the West as a pretext for attacking the socialist countries and has led to many coarse falsifications. I shall examine the state of affairs in this field in greater detail in another chapter and will restrict myself here to stating only a few facts. About 6,000 appearances are made by foreign artistic troupes and performers each year in about 100 towns in all 15 of the USSR's Union republics. In 1976 alone a total of about 1,500 titles by foreign authors were published in the Soviet Union in edition over 60 million copies. The foreign press has been distributed far more widely in the Soviet Union since Helsinki, working conditions have been improved for the foreign correspondents accredited in Moscow, and contacts between Soviet and foreign journalists have been increased still further. In the last two years the Soviet Union has signed agreements and protocols on the expansion of cultural and tourist links with France, Portugal, Belgium, the USA, Turkey, and a number of other capitalist countries.

In one of his speeches Leonid Brezhnev said that in the Soviet Union "the efforts to implement the Helsinki accords consist of scores and even hundreds of practical undertakings. Though not always conspicuous, they constitute Party and state work of exceptional importance.* The Soviet Union has every intention of continuing this work.

If one looks at the development of European life since Helsinki in general, one can see that despite the counteractions of the opponents of peace and their attempts to play down the significance of the European Conference, this historic meeting has given a new and mighty impulse to the policy of detente and promoted the development of various kinds of co-operation in Europe. This was confirmed in late 1977-early 1978 at the Belgrade meeting of 35 representatives of the European Conference's participant countries. On the eve of that meeting the press in the USA and

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Speech at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on October 25, 1976*, Moscow, p. 46.

the other NATO countries declared that, unlike Helsinki, where important political matters were dealt with, they would make the Belgrade meeting discuss the interests of plain people, of the man in the street. The USA claimed outright that it was the leader in the struggle for human rights and interests.

The Belgrade Meeting and Human Aspirations

On the eve of the Belgrade meeting and while it was in session the bourgeois press took the following line: the tasks of consolidating security and co-operation laid out in the Final Act signed at Helsinki and now being discussed in Belgrade supposedly entered into the sole competence of the governments of the countries which took part in the European Conference, while the man in the street was interested only in cultural and humanitarian contacts, marriages between foreigners, the reunification of families, and so on. At the meeting in Yugoslavia's capital the West was allegedly defending these interests and human rights and these were the main object of the talks.

But what, in fact, happened in Belgrade and which of the delegations really defended the interests of the man in the street?

The vital interests of all people are involved not in just some, but in all the questions discussed in Belgrade, those of peace and security in the first place. Europe has lived through thousands of wars since history began and these have caused tens of millions of deaths. There can be no more urgent a task than to prevent new bloodshed and to ensure the true security of nations. It is on the solution of this key problem and not, say, of others such as making marriages between the citizens of different countries easier that Europe's present and future depend. The humanist potential of the Final Act lies mostly in the fact that it is directed towards detente, towards peace between nations.

"We note with deep satisfaction," said Leonid Brezhnev in Helsinki, "that the provisions drawn up by the conference with respect to the main problems of strengthening peace in Europe serve the interests of nations, serve the interests of all people. . . These provisions are imbued with respect for man, with concern for ensuring that he might live in peace and look to the future with confidence."*

The new Constitution of the USSR reflects immense concern about peace and in particular gives force of law to the basic principles for interstate relations contained in the Final Act. The same concern lies at the basis of the programme of action for securing military detente in Europe put forward by Leonid Brezhnev in October 1977 and contributed by the Soviet delegation as an official document at the Belgrade meeting. The discussions on the problems of security revolved around it. Other proposals by the socialist countries—that the principles of the Final Act be included in the legislation of the signatory states, that military budgets be frozen, that support be given to the special UN General Assembly on disarmament, and so on—all had as their main aim to ensure peace for the hundreds of millions of people who live in Europe. Meanwhile, it could not but be noticed that of the 30 proposals put before the Belgrade meeting by the NATO countries, hardly any touched directly upon the questions of detente and disarmament.

"Democracy is most clearly manifested," wrote Lenin, "in the fundamental question of war and peace."** And this is precisely the main question—ensuring that most important human right, the right to live in peace—that the representatives of the USA and of some of their NATO

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 582.

** V. I. Lenin, "Report on the Work of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars Delivered at the First Session of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, Seventh Convocation, February 2, 1920", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 319.

allies who like to run eloquent about democracy showed no wish to discuss in Belgrade.

Security and detente, nevertheless, dominated at the Belgrade meeting as the Final Act signed in Helsinki had envisaged and this despite the fact that even before the meeting began there had been calls from across the ocean for it to be turned into a sort of tribunal at which the United States would "demand" that other countries "report on" their observation of human rights. The leader of the American delegation, A. Goldberg, a former US Supreme Court judge, fulfilled this order from Washington by trying from the very first day to lead the discussion away from the problems of security and co-operation and into the sphere of verbal exercises on the subject of democracy. The Reuter correspondent reckoned that Goldberg's very first speech contained about two thousand words on the subject of human rights being infringed by certain people in certain places. The length of his speeches on this subject grew rapidly as the meeting went on.

About whose rights did the American delegate voice concern in Belgrade? With amazing stubbornness he speechified about a small number of renegades in the socialist countries whose rights had been, in his opinion, "infringed upon".

The representatives of the socialist countries did not press for but neither did they run away from a discussion of human rights in Belgrade. In reply to the American delegate's attacks, weighty facts about the human rights situation in the United States itself were brought up: millions of unemployed, racial discrimination, the persecution of fighters for human rights, the case of the Wilmington Ten who were condemned without proof to 282 years of imprisonment, the Watergate scandal, corruption, and so on. It was also pointed out that the USA to this day refuses to sign approximately 30 important international documents and conventions on human rights.

The delegates from the socialist countries proposed in Belgrade that the participant states pass legislation guar-

anteeing the right to work in their countries, ensuring the equality of women, join the International Covenants on Human Rights, and so on. But where was the Western countries' widely publicised "love" of democracy when all these were discussed?

The Belgrade meeting once again proved the tactical nature of human rights campaign now being waged in the West. No demagoguery, however, can conceal the fact that capitalism oppresses man and that it restricts the rights of millions, while socialism was and remains the true supporter and guarantor of human rights.

Practically all the delegations at the Belgrade meeting expressed their satisfaction with the state of affairs in the trade and economic and scientific and technological co-operation developing in accordance with the Final Act. The Soviet delegation in its speeches emphasised that the growing co-operation in the economic sphere was immensely useful to people, that it raised their standard of living, and that it influenced the level of employment in the West and the economic growth rates of the countries which had participated in the European Conference.

The Belgrade meeting's attention in these matters centred on the socialist countries' proposals and especially on the USSR's proposals for increasing co-operation in the fields of environmental protection and the development of transport and the power industry. The topicality of these questions is testified to by the fact that the countries which participated in the European Conference consume two-thirds of the world's energy and produce about the same proportion of the world's pollution. Tens of millions of people, especially in job- and energy-hungry Western Europe, would find themselves enjoying qualitatively better lives if the Soviet Union's proposals are implemented.

Increasing intellectual and physical communication between peoples is the most important point of the cultural and humanitarian sections of the Final Act. As soon as the Helsinki summit meeting was over, Western propaganda took the line of falsifying the state of affairs in this field,

striving to prove that in the West's "open society" all the cultural and humanitarian points had long been realised, while the socialist countries were somehow in debt to the West.

In Belgrade the Western delegations which continued to develop these false theses were obliged to retreat in the face of irrefutable facts and figures. The socialist countries publish dozens of times more works by Western writers, show three times as many television programmes and several times as many films than do the West European countries and America socialist works. Furthermore, the number of people studying West European languages in the countries of the socialist community is hundreds of times greater than of those studying East European languages in the West. The discussion of these questions made for an interesting show in Belgrade. The Western delegations kept saying that statistics and concrete facts were unnecessary and that it would be better not to speak about cultural, public, sporting, and other links involving millions of people, but rather about individual cases of families needing reunification, marriages, visa applications, and so on. It was to this level that they tried to reduce the much richer humanistic content of the third section of the Final Act. When, however, the delegations from the socialist countries put forward proposals about encouraging meetings between young people, sportsmen, and supporters of peace, all the Western delegations which had up until then been trumpeting about the need to increase contacts suddenly came out against them.

Such questions as putting a stop to the subversive activities of the American Radio Freedom and Radio Free Europe stations, prohibiting the making of propaganda for war, encouraging the mass media and journalists to engage in activities in the interests of peace and mutual understanding between nations, and arranging for the distribution of the full text of the Final Act in all the signatory countries were raised within the framework of cultural and humanitarian relations, but the West took up a

negative stance to all of them. That was the real position taken by those who never cease publicising their desire for unrestricted contacts between people and unlimited freedom of information.

The Soviet Union's delegation at the Belgrade meeting considered its main task to collectively reconfirm the historic significance of the resolutions reached in Helsinki and of the basic political principles elaborated there, to reconfirm the line on detente and co-operation, to make another, modest though it might be, step in that direction, and to defend letter and spirit of the Final Act signed by the heads of 35 states from attempts to make the document into a sort of "doctrine of interference" in the internal affairs of other states. All in all, the job to be done was to carry on the positive process begun in Helsinki.

Despite many difficulties, these aims were achieved and the Belgrade meeting has played its role as an important step in the process of detente.

For the Sake of Peace and Freedom

Along with the above-mentioned general tasks to be done in the struggle for disarmament and detente the foreign policy programme approved by the 25th Congress of the CPSU sets a number of other concrete goals concerning various parts of the world. These deal with international security and the Soviet Union will try to carry them out in the years to come.

The task of liquidating the remaining hotbeds of war on our planet, in the Middle East in the first place, figures importantly in this programme. The Soviet Union is taking a clear and constructive position on this question: the complete withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab lands; the restoration of the Palestinian people's lawful rights, including the right to form their own state; and guarantees of the security of all the states of that region and of their right to independent existence and develop-

ment. The Soviet leaders have repeatedly emphasised that the USSR, in its capacity of co-chairman of the Geneva Conference on the Middle East, is ready to co-operate in all efforts made to achieve a just and lasting settlement of the conflict (be they within the framework of the UN or on another basis, including jointly with the USA, Britain, and France) and in any international guarantees of the security and inviolability of all the countries in the Middle East. Helping to prevent an arms race in the Middle East is another task that needs to be done in this connection.

In the course of a few years Soviet diplomacy also has to solve important tasks concerning the capitalist countries, in order to further detente and increase co-operation between states with differing social and political systems.

"Struggle to consolidate the principles of peaceful co-existence, to assure lasting peace, to reduce, and in a longer term to eliminate, the danger of another world war has been, and remains, the main element of our policy towards the capitalist states," said Leonid Brezhnev at the 25th Congress of the Soviet Union's Communists.* And although universal peace is by no means guaranteed, considerable progress has been made in this direction in recent years.

What needs to be done now is to consolidate what has been achieved, to make detente irreversible—to materialise it. This is being done by means of enlarging fields of co-operation and mutual accord with France, by strengthening links with the FRG, our largest trade and economic partner in the West, by turning West Berlin into a constructive element of peace and detente on the basis of a complete observance of agreements made in recent years, by means of increasing good-neighbourly co-operation with Finland and also strengthening links with Italy, Britain, Canada, the Scandinavian countries, Austria, Belgium, and others, and by making use of the prospects that have come up as regards relations with Portugal, Greece, and Spain. In brief, no country in Europe must be left out of

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 20.

the general process of the normalisation of relations and the expansion of co-operation between states belonging to the two systems. A very important and promising factor in this is that the leaders of the largest West European states—President Giscard d'Estaing of France, Chancellor Schmidt of the FRG, Prime Minister Callaghan of Great Britain, and others—have expressed themselves in favour of further developing relations with the socialist countries and of making detente deeper.

It is not difficult to predict that detente in Europe still has a far from easy struggle ahead for it. So complex a source of tension in Europe as the Cyprus problem has yet to be dealt with. The relations between the USSR and a number of West European countries also have difficulties of their own. Behind these there lies the unwillingness of certain influential circles in the West to strive genuinely to overcome the psychology of the cold war. In the FRG, for example, the official line for the normalisation of relations with the socialist countries begun by Brandt and being continued to this day is being attacked by right-wing forces whose positions are essentially revanchist.

All in all, lasting peace in Europe and the irreversibility of detente still have a stubborn struggle ahead of them. "The Soviet Union will apply these efforts," said Leonid Brezhnev at the 25th Congress of the CPSU, "in close co-ordination with the fraternal socialist states, with all the peace-loving and realistic forces in Europe. Before us, comrades, is the great aim of making lasting peace the natural way of life for all the European peoples."*

The heads of the socialist countries' delegations, speaking at about the same time in the Kremlin, announced their support for this line and that they would strive for lasting peace in Europe. This was the general line of the whole of the socialist community.

Soviet-American relations occupied a special place in the 25th CPSU Congress' list of tasks to be done. The

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 24.

change for the better in these relations that had taken place in recent years was of decisive significance to lessening the danger of a new world war and to producing a sounder international climate in all fields. Solid political and legal foundations had been laid for the development of mutually profitable co-operation between the two countries on the principle of peaceful coexistence. The danger that a nuclear war might break out had been to a certain extent reduced. More delegations were being exchanged, cultural exchanges were becoming more frequent, and the co-operation agreements signed in the fields of economics, science, and technology were being implemented. All in all, Soviet-American relations were developing positively.

Current US President Jimmy Carter's declaration of readiness to develop American-Soviet relations and to promote detente together with the new Administration's steps, to reactivate disarmament negotiations evoked satisfaction in the Soviet Union.

It is no secret, however, that influential forces in the USA have no wish to see any improvement in relations with the USSR or even any detente at all and are, therefore, trying to prevent such a turn, calling for a continuation of the former confrontation and an acceleration of the arms race. Washington's interventions on the side of the forces of oppression and reaction in the processes taking place in various parts of the world are also leading to certain difficulties. The Soviet Union has always spoken out against such actions and will continue to do so in the future.

On the whole, however, the future seems bright for Soviet-American relations—that is, if they are developed on the realistic basis created jointly in the last few years and if the clashes and disagreements that are inevitable given the obvious class and ideological differences between the two states are settled not by force or sabre-rattling, but by peaceful political means at the negotiation table. "The Soviet Union," said Leonid Brezhnev at the 25th Congress of the CPSU, "is firmly determined to follow

the line of further improving Soviet-US relations in strict accordance with the letter and spirit of the agreements reached and commitments taken, in the interests of both peoples and of peace on earth.”*

The positive development of the situation in Europe, the improvements in Soviet-American relations, and the general normalisation of the international climate are putting the question of enlarging the framework of the detente process on the agenda. The foreign policy programme put forward by the 25th Congress of the CPSU specially mentions the need to take measures to ensure security in Asia on the basis of the joint efforts of that continent's states. It should be mentioned in this connection that the Congress reaffirmed the Soviet Union's line favouring the development of relations with our Far-Eastern neighbour, Japan, one of the most highly developed capitalist states in the world.

One other question is greatly involved in political relations between states with differing social systems. I am speaking here of the need to eliminate discrimination and any artificial brakes to international trade, to liquidate all unfairness, *diktat*, and exploitation in international economic relations. In the matter of relations between the socialist and the capitalist countries, the heart of this problem is clear: the West must refrain from attempts to set unprofitable trading conditions on the socialist countries and from discriminatory practices that date back to the cold war.

The 25th CPSU Congress' foreign policy programme further raised as a separate point one of the most important international tasks yet to be done—that “of completely eliminating all vestiges of the system of colonial oppression, infringement of the equality and independence of peoples, and all seats of colonialism and racialism”.** Despite the national liberation movement's great successes, the decolonisation process has still not been complet-

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 26.

** *Ibid.*, p. 32.

ed. The peoples of over 40 territories, including Zimbabwe and Namibia, are to this day still suffering under colonialism's yoke. That the 25th Congress of the CPSU raised this task is seen in the world as a confirmation of the Soviet Union's loyalty to its course of supporting the peoples fighting for their national liberation.

These are the main tasks that now need to be solved if peace, the security of nations, and the progress of mankind are to be promoted. The CPSU sees the proposals as an organic continuation and development of the Soviet Peace Programme. The Soviet state's foreign policy will aim at solving these tasks in co-operation with other peace-loving states and progressive forces.

Socialism's most active ally in the struggle to carry out these tasks will continue to be the worldwide mass peace movement and our country will spare no effort to draw ever more people on every continent into this noble endeavour.

The developing states that appeared as a result of the downfall of imperialism's colonial system have for many years now been another ally of socialism's in the world arena. The overwhelming majority of them find themselves in accord with the socialist countries, because both groups are profoundly devoted to peace and freedom and detest all forms of aggression and exploitation.

The last congress of the Soviet Union's Communists provided a profound analysis of the processes that are now taking place in the developing countries, pointing out that they have already contributed significantly to the general struggle for the peace and security of nations and that they will be able to do still more in this direction in the future. The government circles, political parties, and public figures of the developing countries are becoming ever more conscious of the fact that a policy of peace and detente creates conditions that are more favourable to their social, national liberation, and general democratic struggles. Speaking at the 25th Congress of the CPSU Comrade Dange, the Chairman of the National Council of the Communist

Party of India, said: "Far from putting a brake on the struggles of the anti-imperialist and democratic forces, détente is actually facilitating such struggles and is uniting these forces and constantly broadening that unity throughout the world."

At the 25th Congress of the CPSU Leonid Brezhnev declared that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet state fully supported the legitimate aspirations of the developing countries and their anti-imperialist liberation struggle. It was once again reaffirmed that the USSR would continue its unwavering line on close political and economic co-operation with India, a great country with which relations were developing on the basis of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and, Co-operation concluded a few years earlier; on supporting the struggle of the People's Republic of Angola for its independence; on further consolidating links with the progressive states of the Arab world; with our good neighbour Afghanistan; with the African countries, including our traditional friends the Republic of Guinea and the People's Republic of the Congo; with the peoples of Guinea-Bissau, the Cape Verde Islands, and Mozambique who had recently won their freedom; and with the peoples of Ethiopia and Peru who had started down the path of progressive transformations—in short, with all the states and peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America who were prepared to struggle or were struggling together with the socialist countries for peace and security on this planet, for social progress and for national liberation.

The Soviet Union's principled position in the matter of solidarity with the nations of the world struggling for their freedom and independence from the very first years of the Soviet state's existence received the highest praise of true revolutionaries. This opinion was voiced again in the speeches of many foreign guests at the forum of the Soviet Union's Communists. Let me quote here from the speech made by one of the most popular revolutionaries of our day—Fidel Castro. "I am not speaking on behalf of the

others," he said in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, "but I know that since the moment the Soviet state was established every fighting people, be it in Europe, Asia, Africa, or Latin America, have been able to count, as our people have, on the support and solidarity of the Soviet Communists. And wherever there are grateful hearts, where the sense of justice and common sense exist, this will not be forgotten."*

* *Our Friends Speak. Greetings to the 25th CPSU Congress, Moscow, 1976*, p. 35.

IV

DETENTE: WHO PROFITS AND WHO LOSES FROM IT?

There is quite a lot of talk in the West nowadays about detente being a blessing for some and a curse for others. But to anyone who has a sober mind, however, it must be clear that putting a stop to the arms race and increasing international co-operation is in the interests of all peoples no matter where they live, how old they are, or what the colour of their skin is.

Let us look at what the policy of peaceful coexistence, detente, and disarmament is doing for mankind.

"I Want to Be Alive"

The following incident was so striking that it actually made the papers. An American schoolboy was one day asked to write an essay on the subject "What do you want to be when you grow up?" His essay consisted of the four words: "I want to be alive."

There must be an equivalent in every language to the Russian proverb "The truth speaks in the mouths of little children". In the above case the little American boy told the bitter truth of our age—that a significant proportion of mankind will die if a thermonuclear war breaks out. The schoolboy may have been influenced by the fact that the American press not infrequently (and as a rule with far from pure motives) discusses how many people will be killed in the USA in the case of a "total nuclear strike" by the Soviet Union. Some say 120 million, others provide a slightly smaller figure.

I have already quoted figures on the quantity and total power of the nuclear and other weapons held in the world.

Meanwhile, the world's arms stockpiles are continuing to grow rapidly. And it is not a matter of just the USA's and the USSR's arsenals, but of those of other countries as well. Specialists have calculated that about 30 countries besides the nuclear powers will by 1980 possess enough plutonium to be able to make 50,000 atomic bombs. Reports keep appearing in the press about Israel and the Republic of South Africa already having atomic weapons and these countries' policies are such that they could lead one day to major military explosions of international significance.

Another, at first sight unusual, problem also exists. This concerns the exceptionally rapid growth of terrorism in recent years. If today terrorists place conventional bombs in airplanes and airport left-luggage lockers, should nuclear weapons proliferate widely they will be able in twenty or thirty years to use atomic bombs as well. A number of specialists now openly state that such a possibility is by no means to be excluded.

A terrible chain reaction of nuclear explosions could be started in various ways in various parts of the world. One of the most important aims of the policy of detente and disarmament—that of eliminating the danger of nuclear war—is, therefore, a matter of equal concern to all the people of our planet.

And what about the immense human, material, and intellectual resources that the arms race swallows up? Nearly 70 million people are lost to peaceful labour, because they either serve in their countries' armed forces or are employed in military industries. About 400,000 scientists are employed to design and improve weapons. Approximately one billion dollars are burnt every day to fire the furnace of the arms race. And this is at a time when millions of people are hungry, illiterate, and lack much needed medical services. One nuclear-powered aircraft-carrier costs the same as 2.8 million tons of wheat; one jet bomber costs as much as 100,000 tons of sugar. We now spend on the arms race one and a half times as much as we do

on education and three and a half times as much as we do on public health.

It is sometimes argued that the arms race has more pluses than minuses for the capitalist countries, because it allegedly ensures economic growth, scientific and technological progress, employment, and so on. This is nothing but propaganda to deceive the working people. The arms race cannot save capitalism either from cyclic economic slumps or from unemployment. The fact that despite the all-time high in military expenditures the number of unemployed in the industrially developed capitalist countries amounts to 18 million people speaks for itself. Moreover, specialists, including American ones, long ago already calculated that capital investments in peaceful industries create more jobs than they do in the military ones.

The immense allocations for military purposes make it harder to solve such problems connected with production as finding jobs for young people, providing professional training, and so on. That the arms race helps raise taxes in the capitalist countries is so obvious that it hardly needs mentioning. According to one Western trade union journalist, of the total taxes paid by the average American family of four, 2,000 dollars are used for military purposes, while only 300 dollars go to public health and 257 dollars to education and social security.

The policy of confrontation and the arms race are aggravating capitalism's economic crisis and are leading to currency troubles, inflation, and a higher cost of living. All this, naturally, hits the tax-payers' pocket in the first place. Even in the world's richest country—the United States of America—27 million people, according to official figures, do not earn the subsistence minimum, millions are illiterate, the crime rate is rocketing, and the problem of environmental pollution is growing to colossal proportions. The government openly recognises that it lacks the "several thousands of millions of dollars" needed to solve these problems, although the public knows perfectly well

that the USA spent 150,000 million dollars on the useless Vietnam war alone, and that the country has spent about 3,000 billion dollars on the arms race since the war.

When I was in Britain I frequently saw people sleeping on London's park benches and at first I thought that they were cranks or drunkards. It was just so hard to believe that in our day and age there could be in that allegedly respectable city both homeless beggars looking no better than tramps straight out of Dickens' novels and districts of comfortable houses and brightly lit shop windows. I took a look at the official statistics and found the following figure: 27,000 homeless are registered in London. These are in the main old people whose pensions are so miserly that they cannot even rent the tiniest of rooms, or chronically unemployed people including some who are quite young.

In Great Britain, as in the United States, the government never has "enough money" for housing construction and social security, but, at the same time, spends billions on the arms race, including nuclear weapons, on the upkeep of the Rhine Army in the FRG, and on its "military presence" on the seas and oceans of the world.

The workers of the capitalist countries have learned to translate newspaper reports of their governments' military allocations into the language of day-to-day facts and figures: how will it affect their pockets? In Belgium the trade unions have calculated that if the 30,000 million francs which the government has set aside to buy new fighter planes were invested in the country's peaceful industries, thirty thousand new jobs would be created. Arguments have been going on for many years now in the United States about where to find the money to rebuild crisis-ridden towns and how to create jobs for millions of unemployed. The *New York Post* wrote on this subject that rebuilding towns would create far more jobs than any military programme. The deadly nuclear arms race has for many years unbalanced the American economy; it is an expensive anachronism.

Ever more working people in the West are making the connection between their economic misfortunes—unemployment, the higher cost of living, and insufficient social security—and militarism and the arms race. It is no coincidence that in recent years many trade union and workers' party conferences and congresses, not to speak of Communist organisations, have passed resolutions against the arms race and in support of the policy of peaceful coexistence. It is indicative that following 1975 many trade unions and parties in the West European countries also passed resolutions approving the results of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and expressed themselves decisively in favour of the line towards international detente.

Of course, it is not only the Communists and their allies who care about the policy of peaceful coexistence in the capitalist countries. The ruling classes of these countries have in recent times also seen a particularly marked rise within their midst in the number of supporters of the transition from confrontation to peaceful coexistence with socialism and in the number of politicians and public figures who recognise that detente and the expansion of mutually profitable co-operation with the socialist countries is more in their interests than cold warfare. Willy Brandt, the former Chancellor of the FRG, once said that the country's society and economy would develop further and better under peaceful international conditions.

The economic interests of the capitalist countries and especially of that section of the bourgeoisie which is not connected with the military-industrial complex and the arms race, but, on the contrary, stands to gain from the development of peaceful industries and the expansion of international economic links are playing a role of no small importance in this. Influential members of the bourgeoisie of many countries are now coming out in support of detente and the expansion of economic relations with the socialist countries. One cannot help recalling what Lenin said in this connection: "We fully anticipate a

peaceful attitude, not only on the part of the workers and peasants ... but also on the part of a huge section of the reasonable bourgeoisie and the governments."*

Ever more people in the capitalist countries both on the level of the "man on the street" and on the level of their ruling circles are thus coming to recognise that they personally stand to gain from detente and disarmament. This feeling will spread ever faster and will come to be shared by ever more people if the money saved as a result of the first positive steps in slowing down the arms race is used for peaceful purposes and not for other things within that same military budget. Furthermore, the amount of money involved is by no means small. Just think of how many jobs it would be possible to create, how many towns it would be possible to develop, and how many people could be given medical treatment with this money!

For its part the Soviet Union does not conceal that it is sincerely striving to reduce military allocations and to cut back the non-productive expenditures on the arms race, because Soviet society needs every rouble for its economic and cultural progress and for raising the Soviet people's standard of living.

In the Interests of All Nations

It would be totally incorrect to believe that the problem of disarmament and detente concerned only the USSR and the USA or only the socialist and capitalist countries and did not require that the great mass of developing countries take an interest in it.

Firstly, tension and confrontation creates hotbeds of tension all over the world. A large number of peoples are

* V. I. Lenin, "Letter to the Political Bureau Re the Resolution of the Ninth All-Russia Congress of Soviets on the International Situation", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 139.

obliged to engage in armed struggles against those who would wish to enslave them, to fight for their freedom and independence. This is a just struggle and it enjoys the support of all the world's progressive forces. On the other hand, however, imperialism keeps resorting to aggression in various parts of the world, obliging the young independent states to arm themselves, to maintain armies, and to spend more and more on these aims. Thus, the African countries' military expenditures have in the last fifteen years increased tenfold and those of the Middle East countries thirteenfold (the latter have in recent years been the world's largest arms buyers, spending many thousands of millions of dollars on them). In 1960 only two developing countries possessed supersonic military aircraft: today there are over 40. If one considers the economic difficulties which the majority of developing countries experience, it is easy to imagine what a burden military spending must be to them.

Secondly, there is a direct connection between the arms race and the solution of a number of questions of a global nature that simply cannot be solved without joint efforts, without the general co-operation of all countries living in peace and security. What are these?

Mankind has entered the last quarter of the 20th century heavily weighted down by problems of this kind. About 500 million people are starving on our planet. UN specialists have calculated that between 500 and 1,000 million people may die of starvation before the century is out. Gigantic epidemics that kill thousands keep breaking out first in one country then in another. According to UNESCO statistics, there are 783 million illiterates (aged 15 and over) in the world. Consider a few more figures: to satisfy the most urgent needs of those who are hungry today would cost just 8,000 million dollars. It would cost the same again in order to teach the world's illiterates to read and write. Cannot the human community help the developing countries to find this sum? It could, but on one condition: what is needed is peace, security, and co-opera-

tion between all states. And there is only one way to achieve that—detente, because it is unrealistic to count on one or other state regularly allocating these sums from its budget to help the developing countries while it itself is the target of another state's rockets and atomic bombs.

It should also be taken into account that an atmosphere of detente creates conditions that are more favourable to the Third World nations' struggle for their national and social liberation and in which it is easier for the states where socialism has been victorious to help them. In posing the concept of peaceful coexistence as the principled long-term Soviet foreign policy line, Lenin was thinking not only of the interests of the socialist revolution in Russia, but also of the vital interests of the popular masses all over the world. As the leader of the October Revolution saw it, this course would lead to the simultaneous achievement of several interconnected aims: it would ensure peaceful conditions for the building of socialism, centering the competition between the two systems around peaceful objects in which the new system could better demonstrate its superiority, and, at the same time help other peoples, and in the first place the colonial ones, in their struggle for social and national liberation. We are today seeing how the affirmation of the principles of peaceful coexistence in international relations is tying the hands of imperialism, preventing it from intervening in the revolutionary processes running their course in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Over ten new nation-states have made their appearance in the last decade alone. As a result of the democratic forces' victory in Portugal and the successes of that country's African colonies' armed struggle, the last of the once vast colonial empires has been liquidated. The hour of the final downfall of colonialism has struck and soon the sun of freedom will rise over Zimbabwe, Namibia, and other corners of the world still under the colonialists' boot. Can it possibly not be clear that if there is tension and confrontation imperial-

ism will be more tempted to play its former roles of gendarme of the world and of strangler of the national liberation movement and to employ, as it frequently did in the past, its military clout?

The very atmosphere of the cold war was used by imperialism as an excuse to trample on the rights and interests of the developing states. Besides, it was precisely during the years of the cold war that military blocs were set up in the Third World and used to tie a whole number of developing countries to the West's military bandwagon. Detente and the liquidation of hotbeds of war have already begun to change this state of affairs. Thus, very recently indeed, in 1975, SEATO, a military bloc created by John Foster Dulles to be the "gendarme of Southeast Asia", finally disintegrated. A whole number of developing countries to this day, however, continue to spend thousands of millions of dollars on military purposes. Clearly this money will be used, as detente spreads and the arms race slows down, for such needs as developing the economy, education, public health—that is to say, for all that the former colonies need so badly.

The recent change in the balance of power in the world arena in favour of socialism is making it easier for many developing countries to advance along the road of progressive socio-economic transformations. Such states as India, Algeria, Iraq, Peru, and many others exemplify this.

That is why the conferences of the heads of state and government of the non-aligned countries held in recent years so highly praised the Soviet Union's and the other socialist countries' foreign policies directed towards the acceptance of the principles of peaceful coexistence and of detente.

If one looks at the economic side of the matter, then here, too, the developing countries may reap a good harvest from detente. It is well known that the majority of developing countries inherited mass poverty, illiteracy, and backwardness from imperialism's colonial system. The

Third World covers a vast area and is inhabited by over half the world's population yet it produces only 14 per cent of the capitalist world's industrial output and brings in only 30 per cent of total world earnings. The national income per head of population in the developing countries is on average over ten times less than in the highly developed capitalist states.

The imperialist monopolies' neo-colonial exploitation of the Third World is continuing to this day: economists have calculated that the yearly profits made by the imperialist states out of the developing countries amount to 18-20 billion dollars. This is considerably more than the total amount of economic aid the West gives to the Third World.

The countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have for a long time already been demanding that this exploitation cease and an end be put to these unequal relations. In the current international situation the West has in one way or another been obliged to take heed of this voice that has the support of the socialist states. The special sessions of the General Assembly, for instance, held in 1974-1975 at the demand of the developing countries discussed such problems as the Third World's debt burden, the increasing gap between it and the developed states, the fact that the Western monopolies oblige the developing countries to accept unfair prices for their raw materials and manufactured goods, and so on.

Many delegates at these forums especially emphasised the significance of the proposal put before the UN by the USSR that the great powers reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent and use a part of the money thus saved to fund aid to the developing countries.

For their part, the representatives of the Soviet Union and of the fraternal socialist countries decisively supported the young states' just demands on the grounds that consolidating international security and the further spread of detente are imperative if the whole of mankind, the Third World included, is to progress socially and econom-

ically. Lasting peace will, naturally, enable the socialist community to give still more economic aid to the developing countries.

This aid is now impressive: the USSR has bilateral agreements on economic and scientific and technological co-operation with 54 countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The USSR has helped the developing countries to build and start up about 2,000 industrial enterprises and other projects. The CMEA countries have rendered and are continuing to render economic and technological assistance to 64 developing countries in the building of 3,000 industrial and other projects in the national economy. Of these, over 2,200 have been completed and are already operating. The credits made available by CMEA to these countries for their economic development now amount to about 12,000 million roubles.

In order to promote the radical reform of the Afro-Asian countries' colonial economic structures and to consolidate their economic independence, over 70 per cent of the Soviet Union's aid is poured into these countries' industries. Metallurgical plants are being built in a number of developing countries with help from the CMEA countries and the Soviet Union in the first place. These will eventually have an output of 27 million tons of steel a year, more than triple the amount of steel the Third World produced in 1960. In India the industrial enterprises built with assistance from the USSR now produce 80 per cent of the country's electricity, about 20 per cent of its steel, and so on.

The training of qualified national cadres occupies an important place in the co-operation between the socialist and developing countries. Over 25,000 students and post-graduates from the developing countries are at present studying at universities and institutes in the CMEA countries. Tens of thousands of young specialists are being trained in higher and special secondary educational institutions and other educational centres built in the Third World with aid from the socialist countries. Training is

also provided directly on the industrial and other projects built in co-operation with the socialist countries.

Some of these projects have become symbols of the USSR's selfless aid to the developing countries and their names are known worldwide: the Aswan High Dam in Egypt, the Bhilai Steel Plant in India, the grandiose hydrotechnical complex being built on the Euphrates in Syria, and many others.

World socialism's solidarity with the young states of Asia, Africa, and Latin America is also to be seen in action in the two groups' joint struggle against imperialism and for national liberation and in the struggle to consolidate international security and ensure detente. "We know full well and always bear in mind," said Leonid Brezhnev, "that, together with the peoples of the socialist countries, the peoples of the Asian, African, and Latin American states form an important contingent, so to speak, of the standing army of peace in international relations. Together we have accomplished a great deal, and we are convinced that our ways will not part."*

An Instrument of Co-operation

There is, perhaps, no sphere of international life in which the advantages of detente have made themselves felt so quickly and obviously as in that of interstate trade and economic links. One of the reasons for this is that every country needs to develop fruitful links at the present stage of the scientific and technological revolution and in conditions of an objective growth of the economic factor in interstate relations.

It has recently been claimed quite frequently in the West that the socialist countries only "made up their minds" in the last few years to develop trade with the West and even entered the path of detente only for the sake of the

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, pp. 207-08.

advantages to be derived from economic co-operation with capitalism. This "thesis" distorts reality both as to its essentials and historically.

Over the years the Soviet Union and the West have seen periods in which trade between them developed rapidly and periods in which it slumped (such as when the imperialist states tried to organise an economic blockade of the USSR, placed embargoes on the sale of many goods to it, and so on). At each stage, and this is quite understandable, the amount of trade done depended in the first place on the state of the political relations between the socialist and capitalist countries.

The great attention Lenin devoted to Soviet Russia's economic links, to trade with the capitalist countries and the United States in the first place is well known. "We are decidedly for an economic understanding with America," he told a correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News*, "—with all countries but *especially* with America."* Lenin proceeded from the fact that life itself would force the capitalist countries to seek "the development, regulation, and expansion" of such links with the Land of Soviets and that "this fundamental economic necessity [would...] make a way for itself."** Lenin furthermore considered trade and economic links as not just an important channel through which to satisfy the needs of the socialist national economy, but also as an instrument of peace that would promote normal political relations and the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems.

The mutual dependence of detente and the development of trade and economic and scientific and technological links on each other has been confirmed yet again in recent years. Along with the traditional and solid co-opera-

* V. I. Lenin, "Answers to Questions Put by a *Chicago Daily News* Correspondent", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 51.

** V. I. Lenin, "Eleventh Congress of the RCP(B), March 27-April 2, 1922", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 265.

tion in these fields between the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries (55.6 per cent of the USSR's total foreign trade turnover is with them), the volume of Soviet trade with the leading Western countries has risen sharply in recent years, too. In 1976, 32.9 per cent of the USSR's trade turnover was with the industrially developed capitalist states—in fact, the Soviet Union's total trade turnover with them nearly tripled in the course of the Ninth Five-Year Plan to reach a sum of over 18,600 million roubles.

The Soviet Union's most important capitalist trading partner is the FRG; in 1976 our trade turnover with that country amounted to about 11,000 million marks. Next in line are Japan (2,100 million roubles), Finland (2,000 million roubles), Italy (1,800 million roubles), France (1,700 roubles), Great Britain (1,200 million roubles), and other countries.

All in all, while in 1950 the USSR had trade agreements with 29 countries and a total foreign trade turnover of 2,900 million roubles, in 1976 our country engaged in trade with 117 countries and had a trade turnover of 56,800 million roubles.

Detente has made it possible for long-term trade and economic agreements to be concluded between socialist and capitalist states. The Soviet Union has by now concluded such agreements (they are, as a rule, for a term of ten years) with France, the FRG, Finland, Italy, Britain, and several other countries.

Large-scale economic deals on a long-term basis have been particularly typical of the last few years. Thus, in April 1973 a comprehensive economic agreement was signed in Moscow with America's Occidental Petroleum Corporation on co-operation in the construction in the USSR of a mineral fertiliser plant and on US deliveries to the USSR and Soviet deliveries to the USA of various chemical goods. This agreement was for a term of 20 years and envisages a trade turnover between the two countries in the order of 20,000 million dollars.

A number of agreements have been signed in recent years with state and private organisations and firms in Austria, Finland, France, Italy, and the FRG on the delivery to these countries for a period of 20-30 years of Soviet natural gas. These agreements furthermore provide for the pipes, trucks, and other equipment bought on credit from them for the Soviet gas industry to be repaid in kind—in natural gas. Thus, in accordance with the agreement signed during Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's visit to Moscow in October 1974, the Soviet Union will provide the FRG with tens of billions of cubic metres of natural gas in exchange for large-diameter pipes and equipment for the gas industry. French firms are taking part on the same basis in supplying equipment for the Ust-Ilimsk timber complex, while the Italian concern Montecatini-Edison is co-operating in the building in the USSR of several large chemical plants, Finnish firms are taking part in the construction in Karelia of a mining and concentrating plant, and West German firms in the building of a metallurgical combine near the Kursk deposit.

The rapid growth of the USSR's foreign trade and the combination of various forms of foreign economic link are helping the Soviet Union to buy the most up-to-date equipment for many branches of its economy. This makes for tremendous economies if one considers the gigantic scale on which industry is being developed in the USSR. At the same time, this also makes it possible to increase consumer goods imports.

In the product-pay-back and other large deals mentioned above, I have been speaking in the main about Soviet deliveries of raw materials in exchange for Western equipment. It should, however, be kept in mind that the Soviet Union does not only import modern equipment, but also exports it to the West, together with manufactured goods, on a massive scale. Here is a small and in the direct sense of the word illuminating example: in the autumn of 1974 the Soviet Union exported to Italy its millionth television tube; by 1980, several million Italian television sets will

be working with Soviet parts. Other Soviet-manufactured goods that are becoming ever more popular abroad include cars, tractors, bulldozers, watches, machine-tools, excavators, metal presses and stamps, ball-bearings, optical equipment, and so on.

It is thus easy to see how profitable the expansion of foreign economic links is to the USSR's economy and how this improves the Soviet people's standard of living. It is no less obvious that far-ranging and mutually profitable links of this kind mean that other states stand to gain from long-term peaceful co-operation and that such links promote stability in the political relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist states and give concrete content to the policy of peaceful coexistence. And so, after the long years of the cold war with its bans on trade with the socialist countries, its "embargoes" on all sorts of goods, and its "lists of strategic goods", the political detente which has begun is opening the road to large-scale mutually profitable trade which will, in its turn, consolidate political detente and make it go deeper.

The above, naturally, is true not only for the Soviet Union, but also for all the socialist countries. All of them have in recent years activated their foreign policy activities and considerably expanded their trade and economic, scientific and technological, and cultural links with other countries. It is an axiom for all of them that peaceful coexistence is a great advantage for their economies and socialism's foreign policies.

For their part the capitalist countries' business circles are showing ever greater interest in large-scale trade with the socialist countries, since this assures them reliable earnings and also guarantees them a steady supply of both modern equipment and raw materials and energy. It is a fact of no little significance that, what with mass unemployment in the West, East-West trade and economic links are providing, according to some calculations, jobs for about two million people in the industrialised capitalist countries.

The rapid growth of trade and economic links between the socialist and capitalist states testifies to this course having the support of the greater part of the West's business and political circles, not to speak of the working masses. This objective trend in the world's economic life may, however, sometimes come up against temporary difficulties caused, as experience has shown, by the hostile stand taken by the military-industrial complex and its representatives among the political top-brass of some imperialist countries. In such cases it is the economies of those countries in the first place that suffer.

This happened, for example, at the very end of 1974 when the US Congress, going against the accord previously reached by Moscow and Washington, passed a discriminatory amendment to a trade law amounting to an attempt to interfere in the USSR's internal affairs.

It is quite understandable that the Soviet Union could not permit interference of this kind or agree to trade relations based on this "law" and the 1972 trade agreement between the two countries was as a result not put into effect.

Certain circles in the USA and in the first place the groupings around the notorious Henry Jackson, "the Senator from Boeing" as he is called even on Capitol Hill, tried to use this fact in order to cast doubt on the whole line towards detente and co-operation between the USA and the Soviet Union. What was the result of this?

The US Government dissociated itself from the opponents of detente and of expanding Soviet-American co-operation. The White House announced that it would stick to its course of developing trade with the USSR. Thus, if anyone lost out on this, it was America's businessmen. In 1975 alone American firms lost more than 1,700 million dollars as a result of the artificial limitations placed on orders. According to calculations by specialists from the Chase Manhattan Bank, trade between the USSR and the USA, had discriminatory amendments to the trade law

not been passed, could have reached the 10,000 million dollars' level.

It is indicative that the most important "captains of American business" are ever more insistently speaking out in favour of expanding trade and economic relations with the USSR and eliminating the hindrances to this. These businessmen are no sympathisers with socialism. They are driven by purely economic considerations and they want to make money out of trading with the Soviet Union. The logic of capitalism is such that no force can stop a businessman from trading with someone if this will cause him losses. This is the best answer to those Western propagandists who are trying to sow doubts about the mutually advantageous character of the trade and economic links now growing so rapidly under detente between the two world systems.

The Enemies of Detente

In putting forward the grandiose task of struggling for peace and then working to implement it, the Soviet state and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union were fully conscious of the fact that they would come up against stubborn opposition from imperialism's most reactionary forces.

That two trends—an openly aggressive one and a more or less pacifist one—are to be found within the capitalist world's ruling circles is by no means some new phenomenon. Lenin himself warned of the existence of a moderate and of a military camp in the bourgeois world. He distinguished clearly between the "pacifist camp of the international bourgeoisie" and the "gross-bourgeois, aggressive-bourgeois, reactionary-bourgeois" camp.* And while today one wing of the international bourgeoisie is obliged to recognise detente, the other "aggressive-bour-

* V. I. Lenin, "Draft Decision for the CC RCP(B) on the Tasks of the Soviet Delegation at Genoa", *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 403.

geois" wing, is endeavouring in every way to block this course.

America's military-industrial complex, that is to say the combined forces of the US military industrialists and the generals, form the core of this trend. Why are they so interested in seeing the arms race and international tension continue? Because of cynical self-interest above all. The largest "manufacturers of death", that is to say the giant corporations that make weapons, want to get orders from the Pentagon for rockets, bombers, atomic submarines, and so on worth tens of billions of dollars.

Lockheed Aircraft, General Dynamics, McDonnell Douglas, Boeing.... These are just the tip of a gigantic iceberg made up of hundreds of other corporations whose very existence depends on "low temperatures" in international relations—on the arms race. The budgets of several of these giants are larger than those of many of the world's smaller states and they are putting all their economic might behind the drive to slow down or to torpedo detente. One of the American military-industrial complex's most profitable fields is the selling of arms to foreign countries. According to official figures, arms worth the immense sum 11 billion dollars were sold in 1976 alone by about 1,000 American corporations and concerns.

The rocketing earnings of the monopolies from the arms race are due to both its scale and to the fabulous cost of modern weapons. For instance, according to the foreign press, at the end of the Second World War a fighter plane cost 50,000 dollars, in 1951 one cost 218,000, and now one costs five-seven million dollars. In 1945 a bomber cost 260,000 dollars; now one costs 84 million. A tank cost 40,000 dollars and now—one million. The cost of the American Trident atomic submarine armed with the latest rockets is about 1,300 million dollars. One can well understand that the monopolies should work with all their strength for the preservation of and increases in such large orders, and for the continuation of the arms race and of international tension.

The influence of the military-industrial complex is measured not only in dollars: it has its own representatives in the government, and in Congress and it also owns its own mass media. Henry Jackson, for example, is a typical front man for the military-industrial complex and he is doing his best to prevent an improvement in Soviet-American relations or a lessening of international tension, constantly puts motions on this subject before the corresponding Senate committees, and comes out in the press with calls for relations "from positions of strength" with the USSR. Jackson is not alone in this: fairly influential forces that express the position of the military-industrial complex are to be found in Congress, in government circles, and in the leadership of a number of states.

America's military clique is particularly virulent in its attacks on the policy of detente. The former Commander-in-Chief of NATO, General Ridgway, calls detente a most serious potential threat and compares it to a siren trying to lure the USA to its destruction.

The opponents of detente are of different additional hues in various European countries. The Christian Democratic Union and Christian Social Union opposition parties in the FRG are against the "Ostpolitik", one of the main components of political detente, that is being followed by the government there. Everyone knows of CSU leader Franz Josef Strauss' hawkish declarations directed against the socialist countries. CDU Chairman Helmut Kohl is not ashamed of declaring outright that he favours the arms race however fast it develops. Revanchist feelings, a desire to "correct" the results of the Second World War, and calls not to recognise the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic are still frequent in certain West German circles. Many "psychological warfare" organisations, "émigré" unions of rabid traitors from the socialist countries, and "fellow-countrymen's associations" of former Sudeten, Silesian, and other Germans have all built their nests on West German territory. They regularly hold meetings and organise noisy press campaigns attacking the

policy of normalising relations and developing co-operation with the socialist countries and are invariably supported by the CDU/CSU opposition bloc. Their meetings resemble those of the cold war years and provide a platform for anti-communist speeches and revanchist calls. In fact, they even label the FRG's treaties with the socialist countries as "conspiracies and betrayals".

The enemies of detente in Great Britain also have their own colouring and profile: the old imperial pretensions, desire to interfere on the side of reaction in the processes taking place in the world, to keep anti-communism on the boil, and to play the part of standard-bearer of the cold war are all still fairly strong in that country's conservative circles. This largely explains the fact that British Tories have for many years now been openly swimming against the current of European and world affairs. That as a result of the 1974 elections British conservatives lost power had little effect on their political platform. Margaret Thatcher, the "iron lady" who followed Edward Heath as the Party's leader, and other highly placed Tories are continuing to attack the policy of peaceful coexistence and detente.

NATO's militarists are the loudest opponents of detente in the West. Understanding that the main precondition for the preservation of this aggressive bloc founded at the height of the cold war is the "Soviet threat" myth, NATO's leaders are vigorously inflating it and striving to spread distrust about the socialist countries' foreign policies. The cold war continues, reads an article in *NATO's Fifteen Nations*, the organisation's semi-official journal, and peaceful coexistence is only a temporary state of affairs in East-West relations... We might even say, it goes on, that peaceful coexistence is one of Moscow's cold war weapons and, if truth be told, one of its most effective.

Certain NATO leaders and especially the bloc's General Secretary Joseph Luns, a Dutchman, have recently adopted, along with their notorious lectures on the "So-

viet military menace", a new "thesis"—that detente actually ... stimulates the arms race. Former chairman of the NATO Military Committee Lieutenant-General Steinhoff, a West German, affirmed that political detente made it necessary to have frighteningly powerful armed forces in order to back up this strategy and called for detente to be paid for by increased spending on arms. The NATO generals together with the hawks in the Western countries' governments and parliaments are for the time being actually managing to continue and even accelerate the arms race. Furthermore, the decisions on this matter are usually taken at just the moments when the international horizon is brightening and the prospects for consolidating the security of nations begin to look promising. Thus, in 1973-1975, when the European Conference and the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe were being held, NATO's generals organised an unusually large number of military manoeuvres accompanied by a wave of propaganda and managed to have military allocations increased. Practically all NATO's member-states had record military budgets in 1975. This fact followed former Pentagon chief James Schlesinger's trip around Western Europe (which took place, incidentally, only a few weeks after the European Conference in Helsinki). At his stops in Western Europe's capitals, he demanded that the members of the alliance increase their military budgets. Back in the United States, the Pentagon chiefs requested such immense military allocations for 1976 that there were gasps even on Capitol Hill. But the militarists, nevertheless, got what they wanted—a huge peacetime military budget of 113 billion dollars was granted. (It should be added at this point that a military budget of 126 billion dollars has been approved for 1978). And that is how the so-called Atlantic solidarity, which is manipulated by the militarist circles and by the military-industrial complex in order to continue the arms race and counter detente, works in practice.

It should not be omitted that Israel is making a substantial contribution to poisoning the international atmosphere and continuing the arms race—and not just in the Middle East, but on a worldwide scale. This is to be seen in the fact that the hotbed of tension in the Middle East has for many years now not been put out because of Tel Aviv's expansionist policies, that Israel is in receipt of thousands of millions of dollars' worth of military equipment from the USA every year, and that the country itself is increasing its production of modern weapons. Zionist organisations and the pro-Zionist forces occupy impressively strong positions in many Western countries and are using their financial might and political influence in order to block a just settlement of the Middle East question, an abandonment of the arms race, and further improvements in Soviet-American relations. Using their numerous agents planted in the West's bourgeois press, the Zionists are waging a relentless propaganda battle against the policy of peaceful coexistence.

The army of opponents of detente contains people of various hues, but it must be said that one of its oddest members' is the bureaucratic leadership of the American trade union amalgamation—the AFL-CIO (the American Federation of Labour and Congress of Industrial Organisations). George Meany, the anti-communist who has for many years now led this organisation, tells workers that not detente, but an arms race, not co-operation between the USA and the USSR, but confrontation between the two powers, and so on are in their interests. Using both the carrot and the stick and a bureaucratic voting system, this position is claimed as the platform of the whole fourteen-million-strong trade union amalgamation. The AFL-CIO Congress in October 1975 once again passed resolutions on foreign policy matters that were reminiscent of the worst days of the cold war: one was against any reduction in the USA's military budget, another called for increased military aid to be given to Israel, yet another demanded that trade union contacts between the capitalist

and socialist countries be stopped, and so on. Even in the United States it is widely recognised that this cold war echo does not reflect the true feelings of the country's working people. That, of course, is undeniable. But one should, nevertheless, not underestimate the harm that reactionary figures such as Meany are in the meantime doing to the matter of improving Soviet-American relations and in the final count to the victory of the policy of detente and peaceful coexistence.

Peking has recently been playing an ever more active role in the camp of those who are poisoning the planet's atmosphere. China's present political leaders have allied themselves closely with the most outspoken representatives of international reaction—with the racists, the Israeli aggressors, the Chilean junta, and with all the forces of imperialism and neo-colonialism. Having made anti-Sovietism the cornerstone of its foreign policies, the Chinese leadership has subordinated the whole of its diplomacy and ideology to this task. Chinese propaganda is now calling the principles of peaceful coexistence nothing else but "treachery", "a conspiracy with imperialism", and so on. They are contorting themselves to prove that the USSR has become "bourgeoisified", that it has "betrayed" its class aims, and that the policy of peaceful coexistence is, in fact, only designed to serve as a cover for a "conspiracy of the superpowers" against the other peoples.

It should be noted, though, that when the principles of peaceful coexistence began to be ever more widely asserted in the international arena as the norms to govern relations between the socialist and capitalist states and to receive wide public support on every continent, Peking could not without risk to itself simply run these down groundlessly—mainly because the Chinese leaders had begun openly to flirt with the leading imperialist countries in pursuit of their anti-Soviet aims. Corrections were made in Peking's propaganda and the Chinese leaders' theoretical position in the international arena turned into a hotchpotch of incompatible theses—one on peaceful

coexistence and the other on the inevitability of a new world war. It is obvious that the second of these to all intents and purposes negates the first, since it is based on a lack of faith in the possibility of peaceful coexistence or of its being effective and in socialism's ability to be victorious over capitalism in a peaceful competition.

Peking has borrowed from the bourgeois ideologists the false theory according to which the course of historical development is determined by "conflict" between all the small and medium-sized states regardless of their social systems and the two "superpowers"—the USSR and the USA. This is anti-socialist in its very essence. To it Peking furthermore adds the absurd thesis on the existence of "two intermediate zones": the "first zone" (Asia, Africa, and Latin America) allegedly has interests in common with the "second zone" (the medium-sized and small capitalist countries) and these should join together to struggle against the "two superpowers", the Soviet Union being the main enemy there.

Mao Tse-tung's "thoughts" about war and peace amount to the following: hundreds of millions of people will die in a thermonuclear war, but this sacrifice will, according to him, be "justified" by the building of a "new civilisation" on the rubble.

It is notable that Peking's theorists and propagandists try to prove their thesis on the "inevitability of war" with the help of the "arguments" used by the most reactionary Western "Sovietologists". Both the former and the latter are striving to carry the ideological struggle into the sphere of interstate relations and to prove that long-lasting peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union is impossible because of "ideological incompatibility". Both go on about the "Soviets' inherent expansionism" and the "Soviet threat" and both call for an eventual "total confrontation" with the USSR.

As for Peking's attitude towards detente, this is best evaluated by examining China's "European policy". The

Chinese leaders have begun to agitate widely for maintaining tension in Europe, for distrusting the Soviet Union's foreign policy line, for strengthening NATO, and for keeping an American nuclear presence on the continent. The Chinese leaders tried at first to prevent the calling of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and later to play down its significance. The Chinese leaders use literally every talk with Western delegations visiting Peking to call on them "to make no mistake" about the current detente, "not to believe the Soviet Union", and to continue to strengthen NATO as a counterweight to the socialist countries. One West German newspaper wrote that the philosophy of China's foreign policy is simple to the point of crudity: that what is good for the Russians is bad and that what is bad for them is good. The Chinese, therefore, conclude that NATO is good.

According to many commentators, all the most recent visits made to Western Europe by leading Chinese politicians have been devoted to efforts to counteract European detente and especially the success of the European Conference. Speaking in West European capitals they have invariably asserted that the world and Europe are "shaken" and "uneasy" in the face of the threat of "hegemonism" and "expansion" and have called the current detente "illusory", hinting that Western Europe and China have nothing to gain by it.

In May 1975 the Chinese Government announced its decision to establish official relations with the Common Market and to accredit an ambassador to it. At the same time, the Vice-Premier of the Chinese People's Republic spoke out in Paris in support of a united Western Europe once again hinting at a "Soviet threat", and so on. Peking is now willingly and quite frankly opening its arms to those West European politicians who speak out against the Soviet policy of detente and peaceful coexistence. Those who say that the best passport to Peking is anti-Sovietism are absolutely right.

China's propagandists have gone so far in their anti-Sovietism that they are now calling the socialist countries' defence alliance—the Warsaw Treaty Organisation—an “aggressive bloc” and are fighting for the creation in Western Europe of a “joint nuclear force” to be directed against the socialist community. The *International Herald Tribune* reported that Peking was keener than Washington about the creation of a European nuclear force. By supporting the West's militarists Peking is striving to draw Europe and the USA into new conflicts and into a direct clash with the socialist countries, while itself hoping, as the ancient Chinese saying has it, “to sit on the mountain and watch the tigers fight”.

The organ of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany *Neues Deutschland* has concluded that the Chinese leaders are doing all they can to hinder the detente process and the development of normal and mutually profitable relations between all the states on the European continent on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. It goes on further to say that the Chinese are outdoing even the imperialists in their attempts to breathe new life into the “Soviet threat”.

Let us take just the problem of disarmament, a matter in which Peking's position is arousing particular concern worldwide. It is well known that the Chinese leadership has to this day not signed a single international agreement on disarmament questions. Peking rejects the Soviet Union's proposals which are supported by an overwhelming majority of UN member-states on the calling of a World Disarmament Conference and a conference of the five nuclear powers on reductions in the great powers' military budgets. At the same time, the press in many countries reports that an immense proportion of China's national income is given over to the development of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles.

Many foreign commentators point out that Peking's position and actions in the matter of disarmament, in fact, accord with the line taken by NATO circles and by

the representatives of the West's military-industrial complex.

In the United Nations the Chinese delegation invariably takes an obstructionist stand on many international questions. These include not just disarmament, but also the normalisation of the situation in the Middle East, the Soviet proposal that a convention on the non-use of force in international relations and on the total banning of the use of nuclear weapons be concluded (the Chinese People's Republic voted against this draft resolution in the UN together with Albania and the Republic of South Africa), and many other urgent problems.

Peking's reaction to the events in Portugal provided a new confirmation of the fact that China's leaders have completely abandoned any kind of class approach in evaluating international events and that they have completely forgotten the principles of proletarian internationalism. The anti-fascist revolution in that country aroused the Chinese leaders' anxiety because of the appearance, as the Hsinhua Press Agency put it, of a breach in the South Western flank of the European region of NATO. Peking's propaganda repeated very nearly word for word the attacks made by the reactionary Western press on the Portuguese democrats, and the inventions about "Soviet interference" in Portugal's affairs, openly sided with the counter-revolution that was attacking the Portuguese Communists, and encouraged the small, but active groupings in Portugal that maintained links with Peking to engage in provocative demonstrations and attacks on Communist Party and trade union premises. *L'Humanité* wrote that once again anti-Sovietism was leading Peking into the imperialist camp. One could not but come to the sad conclusion, the paper went on, that the hostility being demonstrated by the Chinese leaders towards the Portuguese democratic forces could only be due to their apprehensions concerning the future of the NATO military aggressive bloc.

The adventurist and anti-popular line taken by the Chinese leaders is easily discerned not only in Europe,

but also on other continents. In Asia Peking has territorial pretensions against the USSR, the Mongolian People's Republic, India, Japan, Vietnam, and Thailand. It comes out against the implementation of any idea for collective security on the Asian continent.

In Africa the Peking leaders supported and armed reactionary groupings that tried to take power in Angola and carry out large scale propaganda campaigns against the socialist countries. In the Middle East Peking's position amounts, in fact, to support for Israel's aggressive line. One foreign newspaper reported the former Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs Tsiao Kuan-hua as saying that his country considered the existence of Israel to be advantageous since it could make the antagonism between the Soviet Union and the American imperialists go on forever.

Peking's flirting with Pinochet's fascist junta in Chile, its ready diplomatic recognition by Peking, the expansion of trade, the demonstrative handshakes between Chinese and Chilean diplomats at the United Nations, and so on aroused profound disgust in many countries. The East German magazine *Einheit* justly pointed out that China's current foreign policy constitutes, in fact, a great-power, chauvinist, and negative reaction by its present leaders to the positive changes taking place in the world.

Both the practical moves made by the Chinese leaders in the international arena and their ideological and propaganda stands in the questions of war and peace are convincing the world public of the fact that Peking is going ever further down a path that is quite contrary to the vital interests of the world's working people.

"It should be clearly seen," said Leonid Brezhnev at the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, "that the threat to peace is posed by quite concrete social groups, organisations and individuals."*

All in all, this is no small force and to overcome the

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 320.

opponents of detente will require further joint struggle by all countries, organisations, and individuals who value peace and security on this planet.

This was once again confirmed by the events of late 1976-early 1977 when the enemies of peaceful coexistence started up a massive "anti-detente" campaign, again using the "Soviet military threat" myth, in order to get vast new military allocations passed by the US Congress and Western Europe's parliaments and when they attempted to drive a wedge into East-West relations by creating a provocative hue and cry over "human rights" in the socialist countries and interfering in their internal affairs. It is to be regretted that mankind will not be insured against such relapses into "cold and psychological warfare" while forces hostile to peace, security, and mutual understanding between nations still exist and remain active.

V
**PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE
AND THE STRUGGLE
BETWEEN IDEOLOGIES**

Since Soviet power was established, imperialism has used all sorts of ways and means to "defeat" socialism: the armed intervention after the October Revolution, the economic-blockade, diplomatic isolation, subversive activities, nazi Germany's armed aggression in the Second World War, the anti-Soviet doctrines of "containment" and "rolling back" communism after the war, and so on. The Soviet Union, however, withstood all these, grew stronger, achieved economic might, and became one of the world's most powerful countries. Socialism became a world system and the socialist states began to co-operate solidly. International imperialism was for that reason obliged gradually to abandon its former aggressive militarist plans as regards socialism and to recognise the principles of the peaceful coexistence of the two world systems. Even given the present balance of power, however, influential circles in the imperialist countries do not conceal their intention to use detente and the increase in economic, cultural, and social links between East and West to multiply their acts of ideological sabotage against world socialism in order, to use their terminology, to "erode" it, "loosen" it at the joints, and eventually "transform" it.

"Ideologisation" or "Deideologisation"?

The situation on the international ideological front is seriously disquieting imperialism, because the current unwavering change in the balance of power in favour of socialism and the peaceful line taken by the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries are being accompanied

by an unprecedented spread of communist ideas all over the world. The ideological influence of communism on the world has never for a moment ceased. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union does not conceal that it agitates for socialism in the world arena and that it does this not just by setting an example, by the very fact that the Soviet state exists and is developing successfully (although that is most important), but also by distributing true information about real socialism and Marxist-Leninist teaching. Furthermore, this information arouses a very great deal of interest on every continent.

A fact worthy of note is that, according to figures collected by UNESCO, for many years now the world's most published and most translated works have been those of Lenin (between 1918 and 1975 the works of Lenin have been published more than 1,100 times in 125 languages in hundreds of millions of copies). Is this not a testimonial to the constantly growing interest in communism being shown by the world public as it seeks the answer to the eternal question: what path should mankind choose?

The struggle for the minds of people, that is to say the ideological struggle, has in today's world grown to truly global proportions. What are the basic forces taking part in it? Despite the great variety of conditions and ideological and political trends in the modern world, there are still only two main ones—the socialist and the bourgeois ideologies. It is precisely around the relations between them that the world ideological struggle is centred and this, depending on various concrete circumstances, can express itself in different ways. What Lenin said on the matter remains topical to this day: "The *only* choice is—either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course [for mankind has not created a 'third' ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or an above-class ideology]."*

* V. I. Lenin, "What Is to Be Done?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 384.

The struggle between the two world views—communist and bourgeois—is spreading wider and getting more complicated, is becoming one of the main subjects under peaceful coexistence, and is the first and main reason for the growing role of the ideological factor in contemporary international relations.

With this main reason reflecting the main contradiction of the times—the contradiction between a socialism that has become the leading force in world development and a capitalism that is toiling under its most profound socio-political and spiritual crisis—are firmly connected other factors that are directly promoting the “ideologisation” of international relations. These include the tremendous upsurge of the world revolutionary process, the growth of the communist, workers’, and general democratic movement, and the rapidly growing role played by the broad masses in the political lives of all continents.

As a result of socialist and national liberation revolutions and also under the influence of scientific and technological progress, hundreds of millions of people on every continent have made their entry into the political arena.

Suffice it to say that the downfall of imperialism’s colonial system has since the war led to the appearance on the international arena of over 80 new independent states. The number of members of the UN has risen from 51 in 1945 to 152 in 1978 and this increase was in the main due to Asian and African countries joining. The way in which those countries, with a total population of over 2,000 million people, are going to develop is now being posed as a question of the utmost urgency.

For its part the West has concocted innumerable theories in which their authors strive to provide an apology for capitalism and to discredit socialism, as well as to prove that the socialist way is “inapplicable” in the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In order to spread these “theories” and to foist its ideology on the Third World, imperialism established after the Second World War an immense propaganda apparatus that

included American organisations such as the US Information Agency, the Peace Corps, and so on. All this heated up the ideological and propaganda struggle in the world still further.

The scientific and technological revolution had and is still having a colossal effect in involving hundreds of millions of people in the matters of ideology, propaganda, and information.

The American futurologist Alvin Toffler provides in his book *Future Shock* some interesting figures on the acceleration of mankind's development under the impact of scientific and technological progress and on the role played by information. According to his calculations, 800 generations have lived on the earth in the last 50,000 years. The first 650 of these lived in caves. Written languages appeared only 70 generations ago and the printed word, the book, just six-seven generations ago. Only the last two generations have known electricity, while radio and television were introduced to all intents and purposes during the lifetime of the current generation. His most striking figures, however, are these: one-half of all the material riches on the earth—i.e., factories, houses, roads, etc.—were created in the current generation's lifetime and this generation consumes more energy than all the people who ever lived before them. And again: 90 per cent of the total number of scientists who ever lived live and work today.

The scientific and technological revolution is advancing at an amazing pace in the field of the mass media which are bringing information and ideology to the millions-strong masses. This, of course, bears directly on the cultural and literacy levels of a given population and on how socially active it is. According to data made public by UNESCO, there are over 1,000 million radios and 350 million TV sets in the world (or one for each dozen inhabitants), about 8,000 daily newspapers are published in 390 million copies (not counting several tens of thousands of other periodical publications), there are

250,000 cinemas with seats for an audience of 78 million people at a time, about 550,000 books are printed a year (or nearly 1,500 a day), and so on. The world's developed countries are already today saturated with means of information (in the Soviet Union, for example, 98 out of 100 families living in areas where television programmes can be received possess TV sets). And such novelties as cassette televisions, direct transmissions to home TV sets through communications satellites, "electronic" libraries, videotelephones, and so on are already today on the agenda.

It is being asserted that the "electronic revolution" has already markedly changed the way of life in many countries, that it has sharply increased the overall volume of propaganda and information made available in them. In Great Britain, for example, it has been calculated that the average Englishman spends a total of 12 years of his life watching television (out of the 70-odd years that is the average life expectancy in that country). Ninety-five per cent of Japanese watch television at some time every day. The total amount of time spent by Americans in watching television is already considerably more than that spent in working.

There is no way to judge the consequences of this information "explosion" on the less developed countries in which hundreds of millions of people are for the first time coming into contact with the social information disseminated through these channels and in which, in view of the mass illiteracy, radio broadcasts, and the television networks now being created are the only source of information and have a colossal effect on the world outlook of people.

In the West the scientific and technological revolution in the field of the mass media has already markedly changed the nature of international relations and of modern diplomacy: appeals to public opinion and attempts to manipulate this for particular ends have become ever more frequent. Presidents, premiers, and ministers of

foreign affairs all hasten to appear on television or to speak out from the pages of newspapers in order to convince public opinion of something or other and to strike a propaganda blow against their opponents. Richard Allen, the American diplomat and propagandist, once said that the modern mass media were as important to diplomats as gunpowder to the military. The American author Robert Strausz-Hupé writes that propaganda techniques are even more important than diplomatic devices (in the real meaning of that word) in the struggle for public opinion.

It can, thus, be seen that the reasons for the growing role of the ideological struggle, of propaganda, and of information in all spheres of international relations are very varied and are objective in character. They derive from the profound socio-political, cultural, and scientific and technological processes taking place in the modern world.

Today's Urgent Problems

Around what main problems does today's struggle between the socialist and bourgeois ideologies centre? To answer this question briefly is no easy task. The spectrum of the struggle is as wide as that of life itself, it encompasses literally every sphere of modern man's and society's world outlook. The most discussions and ideological clashes have in recent years been caused by two problems. These are, firstly, what the principle of peaceful coexistence and detente mean, and what relations between the socialist and capitalist worlds will be like in the future, and, secondly, the question of democracy, that is to say, which system better and more fully ensures human rights.

What two main positions oppose each other as regards the principle of peaceful coexistence? The Soviet position has already been described in the section on its aims and purposes as defined by Lenin. As for the West, its ruling

circles have for several decades now proceeded from the assumption that peaceful coexistence with socialism is impossible because of its "radical socio-political distinctions" from "Western civilisation". Hundreds of books and "scientific papers" have been written on this subject. As Professor Fred Neal, an American, admits, the United States was for a long time inclined to believe that the ideological conflict excluded any possibility of peaceful relations. This point of view formed, in particular, the basis of the aggressive doctrines of "containment" and "rolling back" communism and of the nuclear blackmail and arms race policy; it was one of the main reasons for the cold war and for a long time hindered any normalisation of the relations between the socialist and capitalist countries.

Now that the principle of peaceful coexistence is gaining growing recognition in international law, including on the part of the leaders of the Western countries themselves, one wing of the bourgeoisie's ideologists and politicians claims to be prepared to accept peaceful coexistence, while the other wing continues either openly or in a veiled manner to deny that such coexistence is possible.

Falsifying what Lenin's concept really was is now one of the main activities of the West's ideological and propaganda apparatus. For these purposes the principle of peaceful coexistence is portrayed as a "cunning Soviet trap" and there follow calls for a continuation of the confrontation with the socialist countries. Now as several decades ago, a section of the West's politicians and ideologists are striving to prove the impossibility of the two world systems coexisting in real peace for any length of time, because of a so-called rhesus-ideological incompatibility between capitalism and socialism. The aid of Soviet studies and other scientific research institutes specialising in international relations active in various Western countries has been enrolled to provide the theoretical foundations for this "thesis".

According to the *Washington Post*, a wave of nervousness about detente swept certain sections of America's and NATO's leading circles after the important positive changes in Soviet-American relations, the liquidation of the hotbed of war in Indochina, and the successful conclusion of the European Conference. The most rabid opponents of peaceful coexistence redoubled their activities. Senator Barry Goldwater, a man well known for his reactionary views, came out with speeches in which he demanded additional billions to be spent on arms and frightened Americans with the idea that under the smoke-screen of detente the Russians were seizing control over the United States.

Another famous transoceanic reactionary, Alabama's Governor George Wallace, actually went so far as to say during one of his bouts of furiously insulting the Soviet Union and the policy of peaceful coexistence that the United States had fought on the wrong side in the Second World War.

Some Western politicians pretend that they recognise the inevitability of the peaceful coexistence of the two systems, but, at the same time, propose to make more use of the conditions offered by detente to invigorate the struggle against socialism and to "erode" socialist society ideologically until it changes into a bourgeois one. The most cynical definition of this line was made by the leader of the West German CSU opposition party Franz Josef Strauss who declared that the West should view coexistence and detente as a political weapon with which it could ... overcome communism from within.

The situation now taking shape—detente and the expansion of economic, scientific and technological, trade, and other forms of co-operation between states with differing social systems—is seen by a number of Western politicians and ideologists as favourable soil on which to make propaganda for a number of "theories" connected, as a rule, with mankind's future development under the influence of the scientific and technological revolution. A whole num-

ber of such bourgeois theories have now gained currency: Walt Rostow's economic growth stages, John Galbraith's, Raymond Aron's, Jacques Ellul's, and others' single industrial society and convergence theories, Daniel Bell's post-industrial society, the technotronic century theory, and others. The great variety of names here is a matter purely of external decoration and they refer only to details and not to the main points, because all these theories are founded on one and the same idea: that the current scientific and technological revolution and expansion of international economic co-operation will inevitably lead the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries towards a "rapprochement" and later to a "fusion" with capitalism. And in any case, the bourgeois ideologists go on to say, the scientific and technological revolution will transform capitalism into a "society of universal well-being" and will liquidate social contradictions and the class struggle, turning all capitalists into managers and all workers into office staff.

All these false theories fail to be confirmed by life. The surging growth of socialism does not make it at all like capitalism and is not leading to convergence.

Neither can the assertion of the authors of the bourgeois theory that the scientific and technological revolution will lead to an "erosion" of the proletariat and to the resolution of the social contradictions in the capitalist countries hold up under criticism. Suffice it to say that the working class in 1971 numbered 570 million compared to 30 million at the beginning of the century and that the number of people who participated in strikes in Western Europe, North America, and Japan was 225 million in 1968-1974 as compared to 164 million in the five years before that.

The more international support the principle of peaceful coexistence is given, the more frequently is there talk in the West about the "ideological convergence" of the two opposing systems.

It should be kept in mind that the word "convergence" as it is applied to ideology by bourgeois theoreticians is

used not so much as an expression of but as a mask for their true aims, since what they really have in view is, of course, not a "rapprochement" or a "combination" of the two opposing systems, but bourgeois ideology smothering communist ideology.

True and False Defenders of Democracy

Certain Western ideologists and politicians are speaking out in favour of making "more decisive" use of the present state of detente and of greater contacts between East and West to interfere in the socialist countries' internal affairs. This is most frequently done under the banner of the struggle for so-called human rights. This is what these people argue: the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries stand to gain from detente and co-operation and must, therefore, "pay" for it. How? By making available to their citizens the "wide ranging" and "democratic" rights that allegedly exist in capitalist society, since true detente must involve not only states, but "private citizens" as well and this is impossible without "liberalisation" and "democratisation". This is a rough outline of what has frequently been said in many foreign newspapers and magazines and even in thick "scientific" papers produced by Western ideologists on the problems of peaceful coexistence.

Let us for the time being ignore the ridiculous thesis that the socialist countries stand to gain more from detente and co-operation than the West and that they must, therefore, "pay" for it and instead consider the matter of human rights. Just picture to yourself what would happen if a reporter were to go up to people with a microphone on the streets of Moscow and ask passers-by the following question: "Where does one go here to get unemployment benefits?" How would those passers-by react? This was actually once done in the GDR using candid-camera techniques. In reply to the reporter's question some

of the passers-by smiled, thinking that he was joking. Others, thinking that they had to do with a journalist from the FRG, patiently explained that in the GDR every citizen had the right to work and that work was readily available. Yet, others found the question so ridiculous that they just shrugged uncomprehendingly: "Unemployment under socialism?"

The most important, perhaps, of all the human rights—the right to work—has been solved once and for all in socialist society. The problem of free education and many other rights which the people of the socialist world enjoy every day have also been solved in the same way. It would be wise here to remind the reader that millions of people in the Western countries are deprived of even these elementary rights: suffice it to say that in the non-socialist countries there are at present about 100 million unemployed and that hundreds of millions of boys and girls are unable to realise their dream of getting the education that is so necessary nowadays.

The scale of the unemployment is especially catastrophic in precisely those developed capitalist countries whose ideologists are trying to teach others how to live. Moreover, the young are the hardest hit by unemployment. Of the 18 million unemployed in Western Europe, North America, and Japan in 1976, the majority consisted of young people (several million in the USA, 800,000 in France, and so on).

Or take another problem—that of the widespread discrimination against women in the capitalist world. According to figures published by the International Labour Office, the difference between men's and women's pay in France is 17 per cent, in Sweden—24 per cent, in Japan—50 per cent. In the whole of Great Britain there are only 500 women engineers. In the USA women make up only 4 per cent of the total number of lawyers, 7 per cent of doctors, and less than 1 per cent of engineers.

A few years ago there were only 18 women in the US Congress, in France women made up 2 per cent of the

members of Parliament, in Britain 4 per cent, in the FRG 6 per cent, in Italy 3 per cent, in Canada 0.5 per cent. Meanwhile, 475 women were elected to the USSR Supreme Soviet in 1974, and the number of women parliamentarians in the other socialist countries is also about 30 per cent of the total.

Bourgeois propaganda likes to face socialism with a long list of rights and freedoms that citizens in the West supposedly enjoy. This includes, for example, the right of each citizen to publish his own newspapers or magazines. For the time being, however, no worker in the West has ever managed to make use of this right, while Axel Springer, the notorious West German multimillionaire, has: he owns most of the FRG's press and uses it to propagandise low tastes, violence, pornography, and anti-communist ideas. As a French journalist once wittily commented, each citizen in Western society has as much formal right to publish his own newspaper as he does to launch his own space satellite.

One of the most important criteria of democracy is workers' participation in the election of the legislative organs and in their activities. Not less than 99 per cent of the electorate in the Soviet Union actually votes at elections. In the USA only about half the electorate voted at the last presidential elections. In the USSR the organs of popular power—the Soviets of Working People's Deputies of every level—have 2,200,000 seats of which about 900,000 are occupied by workers and over 600,000 by collective farmers. How many workers and farmers are there in the organs of state power in the USA or in the other capitalist countries?

It is rightly said that the best laws are those that actually work. In the Soviet Union the Constitution is not just words: the rights of citizens to work, to education, to social security, to free medical care, and to rest are all ensured in practice. This is precisely what determines the "quality of life" (a fashionable term in the West today) under socialism.

In capitalist society many of the things that are "freedoms" for some turn out to be misfortunes for others. "Free enterprise" is the freedom to exploit or to fire manual and office workers *en masse*, and the "freedom" to publish pornography is the freedom to corrupt the morals of the young.

And what, for example, has yet another "freedom"—the right of the people to keep and bear arms—cost American society? According to statistics, there are up to 100 million firearms in the hands of the American public and these, as experience shows, are not infrequently put to criminal use. In the USA, 750,000 people have died at the hands of criminals since the beginning of the century—more than the total number of Americans killed in all this century's wars. Almost any American can freely buy or even mail-order firearms and they do not even cost very much. For example, the rifle which it is thought was used to kill President Kennedy was mail-ordered and cost only 21.45 dollars. The freedom to sell arms is zealously defended by the corporations that manufacture them, claiming that they are preserving tradition, the "American way of life".

When it comes down to the real human rights—the right to work, to free education, to national and racial equality, to political demonstrations, and so on—the capitalist countries by no means preach "unlimited freedom" and all-permissiveness, but take the most decisive repressive measures against social and political dissidence and workers' demonstrations for their rights.

In late 1973 the Soviet Union ratified two important international documents: the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Here are some of the rights set out in them that the signatory states undertake to ensure: "all peoples have the right of self-determination", "the right to work", "the right of everyone to the enjoyment of just and favourable conditions to work", "the right of everyone to social security, including

social insurance", "the right of everyone to education", "the right and the opportunity ... to take part in the conduct of public affairs", and so on. The Covenant on Civil and Political Rights includes articles prohibiting the propaganda of war, on the liquidation of all kinds of discrimination, and so on.

The Soviet people enjoy these rights daily in accordance with the Constitution of the USSR: they are the natural norms of their lives. It should be added that the majority of articles on social and economic rights in the international covenants mentioned above together with many important articles on civil and political rights were included on the initiative of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries.

What position did the great capitalist powers which in words so zealously defend human rights and try to "teach" democracy to others take in relation to these covenants? They did not sign them. Throughout their many years' work in various organs of the UN they, in fact, always came out against all the rights important to workers, including the right of nations to self-determination, the right of citizens to protection from unemployment and from discrimination on the grounds of race, colour, sex, and language, the right to education and social security when ill or old, and so on. And how could they put their signatures to these international documents when the whole world can see that racial discrimination flourishes in the USA, that the movement for social and national freedom is being cruelly suppressed in Northern Ireland, that ever more millions of workers in the Western world are becoming the victims of unemployment, that fascist terror reigns in Chile and racism in South Africa?

There are numerous examples of how the bourgeois states and their police machines interfere in the private lives of citizens in the Western countries. McCarthyism, a time when many thousands of citizens became victims of what came to be called a "witch-hunt", were fired, and were thrown into prison, has still not been forgotten in

the United States. A scandal flared up a few years ago when it was discovered that the CIA and the FBI were conducting such operations as the drawing up of dossiers on hundreds of thousands of Americans, illegally entering their homes, and bugging telephone calls.

Now that the Western and especially the American press is striving to increase its pressure on the socialist countries in the matter of democracy, one inevitably finds oneself asking: and what in fact gives them the moral right to set themselves up as the defenders of human rights? Is it not in the USA that one scandal after another connected with abuses of power, corruption, and political murders are occurring; are dissidents not arraigned in court there; are the country's Indians not being oppressed; were not American concerns such as Lockheed involved in bribing members of the governments of many Western countries; and did not the CIA promote the fascist coup in Chile?

The Federal Republic of Germany has for many years engaged in the practice of *Berufsverbot*—removing people from and forbidding them to occupy certain positions (in educational institutions, state departments, and so on) because of their beliefs or their participation in political parties and youth and student organisations disliked by the ruling circles. "Loyalty checks" are being carried out on a massive scale: in the last few years, according to the press, over 800,000 have been subjected to such checks and many thousands of citizens were furthermore subjected to humiliating "hearings". The *Erlass über die radikalen Elemente* (Law on the Radical Elements) passed by the West German Bundestag constituted a new anti-democratic step to consolidate this practice in law. Thought-policing has become unbelievably widespread, wrote *Die Zeit* in October 1975. Even the federal constitutional court was obliged to recognise the fact that the thoughts and pasts of thousands upon thousands of the country's citizens have been "X-rayed". The progressive West German public makes a special point of the fact that these anti-

democratic actions are being undertaken since the European Conference in Helsinki and that they go against the spirit of its Final Act. The "objective" bourgeois press, however, does not like to write about this—in the same way as it strove to "forget" Great Britain's shaming at the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg (February 1977) after the Republic of Ireland's official complaint about the widespread use of torture in English prisons in Ulster.

Socialist society differs radically from capitalist society not only in its socio-political categories, but also in the characteristics of its day-to-day life and its way of life. The inalienable traits of man in the socialist world include some that are totally foreign to capitalism, such as genuine collectivism which reflects new and higher forms of interpersonal relations—great conscientiousness, internationalism, and so on. A Soviet, socialist way of life has taken shape once and for all in the USSR. This broad concept includes not only material, but also spiritual factors, a new way of thinking, and a new understanding of democracy. Of the Soviet Union's population of 260 million, 220 million were born after the Great October Socialist Revolution and these have grown up and been educated under socialism. No other way of life, no other democracy is acceptable to them.

And that is how matters stand on the question of human rights and democracy in the socialist and capitalist worlds. The West's pronouncements about democracy under socialism have nothing to do with a true concern for human rights or for the people living in socialist society. Their purpose is quite different: to interfere in the socialist countries' internal affairs in order to create moral and political oppositions there, a Fifth Column which would ally itself with certain forces in the West in attempts to "rock" and "erode" socialism.

Only a desire to interfere in the USSR's internal affairs can, for example, explain the attempts made by a number of American Congressmen to make the development of

Soviet-American trade conditional upon changes in the Soviet Union's internal laws and practices.

It is to be regretted that by their attempts to interfere in the socialist countries' internal affairs these forces are hindering the policy of peaceful coexistence and the expansion of mutually profitable co-operation between the states of the two social systems.

The same may be said of yet another of imperialism's tactical lines in the ideological struggle: the attempts made by Western propaganda artificially to create and blow up the so-called problem of the dissidents in the USSR. What is the meaning of this line and who, in fact, are the dissidents?

This is the word used in the West for the extremely small number of turncoats who are to be found among the Soviet Union's citizens and who speak out against the Soviet state's and the Communist Party's internal and foreign policies, against the Soviet Union's way of life, who fabricate and communicate to the West all sorts of lies, protests, and so on. They are mentioned daily in the Western press and on television as the "victims of socialism", as "fighters for human rights", and other similar phrases.

Their "spiritual leader" was for many years Solzhenitsyn, but the press lost interest in him after he was expelled from the USSR and deprived of Soviet citizenship, because he could then no longer lay claim to the role of "expressor of the aspirations of the Russian people" and turned into a common-or-garden malicious émigré such as are despised everywhere.

What then especially attracts Western propaganda to the "philosophy" of the dissidents, including that of Solzhenitsyn or, say, Academician Sakharov? And what is their attitude to the problems of the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems? The fact of the matter is that in this cardinal question of contemporary international relations Solzhenitsyn, Sakharov & Co, are to all intents and purposes voices in the imperialist choir that demands "changes in the internal practices" of the

Soviet Union "in exchange" for detente, trade, and so on. Should the Soviet state not comply with this "demand", these personages suggest that the West apply the brakes to detente, refuse to develop co-operation with the Soviet Union, apply greater political and economic pressure to it, and so on.

One can get an idea of the direction which the dissidents propose the USSR should take in its internal and foreign policies from a long-winded letter written by Solzhenitsyn that was published in the Western press shortly after he settled in Switzerland. In this letter Solzhenitsyn proposes neither more nor less than that the Soviet people should be allowed an anti-socialist opposition, that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics be "dissolved", that there be a return to the patriarchal way of life, that for this purpose tens of millions of young men and women be forcibly "returned to the villages", that the state abandon its current active foreign policy and, in particular, its alliance with the fraternal socialist countries and its support of the national liberation movement, and so on. Could the enemies of socialism striving to bring about the "rebirth" of the Soviet Union and a weakening of its international positions have dreamt of a better ally?

It should be said that the line on using the very few, but, nevertheless, loud dissidents for anti-socialist purposes is not new in the West. However, their provocative and unreal platform sometimes frightens even the West's ruling circles. The Soviet Americanist, Professor N. N. Yakovlev, writes that in discussing and elaborating America's policies as regards the Soviet Union, Washington's highest circles invariably evaluate the role of the dissidents. Whatever hopes rabid anti-communists place in them, however, the practical politicians usually conclude that their aims are a danger to the interests of the United States.

It is with distaste that George Kennan, a high-ranking diplomat, the former US Ambassador to the USSR, and America's Sovietologist No. 1, speaks of the dissidents.

Having correctly understood that they are in the final count striving to make the West clash with the socialist countries, he writes that the idea which they passionately and sometimes mercilessly cling to is simple—the United States should go to war against the Russian people for their sake ... after which they can take over and rule with American aid.

It might be added at this point that some people who at first turn their eyes abroad with the claim that they are "struggling for democracy" and later simply degrade into counter-revolutionaries are no novelty for the Soviet Union. This happened with Solzhenitsyn, too. He will now pour any dirt on the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and say anything to agitate his listeners to "rally" against world socialism and its foreign policies.

But what do such actions of Solzhenitsyn's—and the world public was shocked by them—as his calls that Vietnam be "saved from the Communists", his compliments to Chile's butcher, Pinochet, and so on mean?

By the time Solzhenitsyn had finally lost the halo of "expressor of the aspirations of the Russian people" created for him in the West and had irrevocably transferred into the camp of the malicious counter-revolutionaries, Western propaganda was already paying more and more attention to Sakharov. This, evidently, thoroughly delighted that dissident and he became more energetic in his activities. Sakharov regularly prepares and sends letters to the capitalist countries calling on the West to rally in a united front against the Soviet Union; he is, thus, in fact speaking out against the development of co-operation between socialist and capitalist states.

Anti-communist propaganda working the "human rights" question reached gale-strength in late 1976-early 1977. For instance, in just one week in early 1977 Western radio stations broadcast to the Soviet Union 120 programmes about "dissidents", while repeats brought the total to 320. These attempts to create artificially an "organised opposition" in the socialist countries are disguised as "con-

cern" about no more than a few dozen dissidents who have either been expelled from the Soviet Union or arrested in the USSR, not, of course, for thinking differently, but for concrete actions falling under the statutes of Soviet law: the preparation and distribution of anti-Soviet materials, foreign currency operations, contacts with foreign intelligence and anti-Soviet organisations, etc. All this just goes to show how much certain Western newspapers despise their readers: they are prepared to present as "heroes", as "fighters for human rights" personages many of whom have criminal past, served prison sentences, and so on.

One of the aims of this propaganda campaign—and this has even been admitted by some Western newspapers—was to poison the atmosphere on the eve of the Belgrade meeting of the countries which participated in the European Conference and to turn it into a "complaints department" against the socialist countries instead of a forum for constructive discussions on how to consolidate peace and increase co-operation in Europe. The organisers of this campaign, however, failed not only to achieve this aim, but also to arouse any worries or discontent whatsoever among Soviet people.

The propaganda hue and cry about these anti-Soviet people cannot prevent either the successful continuation of the building of communism in the USSR or the successes of our country's peace-loving foreign policy line. In the West, too, ever more politicians are coming to understand the unreality and absurdity of counting on the dissidents in international politics.

It is indicative that in connection with the calls of anti-communist circles in the USA for interference in the USSR's internal affairs on the question of the so-called dissidents or of emigration a number of leading figures in the USA have pointed out that such a course would be dangerous for the USA itself, since it would threaten the policy of detente and of promoting Soviet-American co-operation. Certain American commentators have shown how absurd these calls are by putting the question in the

following manner: and what if the Soviet Union were to make detente conditional upon the settlement of American society's internal problems—the race problem, for example?

A true policy of peaceful coexistence implies refraining from interfering in the internal affairs of other countries and from supporting those elements trying to torpedo the process of detente and a normalisation of relations while they hide behind slogans about defending human rights.

Upon closer examination, it turns out that certain circles in the West are using these demagogic slogans to conceal that they are striving to get round the principles of peaceful coexistence and begin a new chapter of the "psychological war". These imperialist circles are presenting their intention of using the process of detente to weaken and eventually to destroy the socialist system to the public as concern about human rights or about the so-called liberalisation of socialism.

Leonid Brezhnev exposed this current tactic of imperialism's in his speech at the Congress of Soviet Trade Unions in March 1977. The creation by means of living advertisements of an appearance of "internal opposition" in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and the hue and cry about the so-called dissidents and infringements of human rights was due, he said, to imperialism's hopes of finding at least some force that would come out against the current state of affairs in the socialist countries. But there were no such forces, since there are no oppressed or exploited classes and no oppressed or exploited peoples in socialist society. The West is trying to present as such a force a few dozen characters who have turned their backs on socialist society, who break its laws, who are connected with imperialist subversive propaganda and intelligence centres. The Soviet Union has taken and will continue to take the measures provided for by its laws against such people. "And in this matter," said Leonid Brezhnev, "let no one take offence: to protect the rights, freedoms, and security of 260 million Soviet

people from the activities of such renegades is not only our right, it is our sacred duty."*

The Soviet people did not acquire their rights easily. The defender and guarantor of the workers' socio-political achievements is the Soviet state and we will, therefore, not stand for any encroachments on its sovereignty or for any interference in its internal affairs. The imperialist circles with their bankrupt and provocative slogan "Change your way of life or it's cold war" must finally come to accept this. One cannot fight for peace while infringing on the sovereign rights of other nations. One cannot work for human rights and at the same time torpedo the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The Right to Know : Who Is Better Informed?

The expression "the free exchange of ideas and information" has become a staple in the lexicon of Western propaganda in recent years. It is used in connection with the problem of peaceful coexistence and applied to both the relations between the socialist and capitalist states and, on a wider scale, to international relations as a whole. What precisely does this term mean to its inventors?

Detente, they affirm, can be profound and sure only if nations get to know each other better, only if more ideas, information, and cultural achievements are exchanged, and only if there are more contacts between peoples. At first glance there would seem to be nothing wrong with this thesis. Its true meaning, however, becomes clear if one examines the real situation that has now taken shape in the world in the field of cultural contacts and information.

I have already mentioned how the scientific and technological progress of the last decades led to the rapid growth of the mass media. Television and radio stations

* *Pravda*, March 22, 1977.

and newspapers, too, are now numbered in the thousands, while there are hundreds of millions of television sets and radios, and newspapers are published in hundreds of millions of copies.

At the same time, it is generally recognised that most countries lack a sufficiently developed information gathering and distribution system, that is to say, a wide network of foreign correspondents and the equipment needed to communicate this information, since it is all in all a very expensive process. The leading imperialist countries' gigantic "information" corporations which have established their monopoly in the information market outside the socialist countries take advantage of this in every way they can. The American news agencies Associated Press and United Press International have the largest networks of correspondents—they are to be found in literally every corner of the globe—and also possess the necessary electronic and other equipment to transmit instantly the information which is collected. Together with the British Reuter and France-Press they are the main suppliers of news for the majority of news organs in the capitalist and developing countries. The population of these countries reads in the main the information collected and specially digested for it by these gigantic ideological monopolies.

A similar situation has taken shape in the world television, radio, and film market. It was calculated two or three years ago, for example, that 150 million people a week outside the USA watched Hollywood films. One hundred and sixty-one American television companies exported up to 200,000 hours of television programmes a year or nearly 550 hours a day (next in line after the United States came Britain—30,000 hours a year, France—up to 20,000 hours, the FRG and Japan—6,000 hours each, Italy—4,000 hours, and so on). In some non-socialist countries American programmes make up over half of all that is shown on their national televisions (the record in this respect is held by Israel). This furthermore applies not only to the developing countries, but also to those of West-

ern Europe—up to one-third of what the latter broadcast is imported from the USA.

In their drive to preserve the audiences for their programmes, the American television companies long ago already began making serials, for the most part detective stories and westerns. Some of these have continued weekly in many countries for years and years, the number of films in each series reaching the hundreds, while audiences are numbered in the hundreds of millions.

All these figures were published in a report prepared by the Faculty of Social Sciences, Journalism and Mass Communication of the University of Tampere in Finland. The report was distributed by UNESCO under the title "Television Traffic—A One-Way Street?". The conclusion to which the authors of this survey analysing the international flow of television programme material came was by no means comforting: vast parts of the world have no choice but to rely practically wholly on Western news agencies as regards information.

The situation in the developing countries is aggravated by the fact that the leading imperialist powers have entangled them in a thick net of "cultural" centres, libraries, and reading-rooms run by the US Information Agency, the Peace Corps, the West German Goethe Institute, the British Council, and others.

All this immense propaganda machine carries out a great deal of purposeful psychological work on the population, singing the praises of capitalism and blackening socialism, in other words, engages in ideological expansion. This often takes the form of direct interference in the host country's internal affairs, especially if these have elected to follow a non-capitalist development path. In such cases the host governments not infrequently expel the "overzealous information-providers" and "promoters of culture". The telegraph keeps bringing reports—from India, Egypt, Iran, and from elsewhere—that correspondents of the BBC and other Western radio stations and newspapers, and members of the Peace Corps and other

similar organisations have been expelled from one or other country.

And that is the situation in the field of information in the world arena. In one of his speeches Finnish President Urho Kekkonen called this situation "informational imperialism" and, at the same time, exposed as nonsense the bourgeois propaganda thesis that freedom of speech reigns victorious in international relations.

What does the West's call for a "free flow of ideas and information" mean under these conditions? It is nothing other than an attempt to force all states to remove the last remaining barriers to imperialism's ideological expansion, to open the flood-gates to the spiritual enslavement of nations.

Furthermore, the West's ideologists and propagandists are thinking not only of the present, but also of the future. This was demonstrated, in particular, by the discussion that has been going on for several years now in various bodies of the UN around the problem of direct television broadcasts using communications satellites. Scientists predict that it will soon be possible to broadcast television programmes from anywhere in the world to the home TV sets of any country on any continent. It is not difficult to imagine what a powerful weapon this technology will be for disseminating the information and influencing the minds of people. The potential danger of ideological interference in the internal affairs of countries unable to afford that technology will be especially great.

Recognising this, the governments and public of many countries have recently expressed themselves in favour of the conclusion of an international convention on the use of the latest means of communication to bring peoples closer to one another and to promote their mutual cultural enrichment and not as a weapon for interfering in internal affairs and infringing upon each other's sovereignty.

This is precisely the aim of the draft convention on the principles to govern the use by states of direct television transmission satellites put before the UN by the Soviet

Union. It has been widely supported by many delegations. The draft convention points out that the transmission of television programmes via satellites directly to home TV sets is one of the most promising aspects of the use of space for the good of mankind. The development of this means of communication will contribute to a further rapprochement between the peoples of the world, to increased international exchanges in the field of culture, and so on.

At the same time, the introduction of direct television transmission via satellites raises serious legal problems in connection with the need to ensure that this new form of space technology should serve exclusively the noble ideals of peace and of friendship between nations. States should be guaranteed the possibility of making certain demands as to the content of programmes to be broadcast from abroad and if necessary to take measures to stop broadcasts that infringe upon their sovereignty or are undesirable from the point of view of that state's culture, morals, or customs.

What position have the leading Western states taken as regards this draft convention? They have come out against it, referring to "freedom of speech" and the need for an unrestricted "exchange of ideas and information". This manoeuvre once again demonstrates the imperialist powers' true intention: they want to use this "inoffensive" slogan to consolidate their rule in the field of information and to promote their ideological expansion against other states and peoples.

Special consideration should be given here to what the West is trying to achieve in addressing its "demand" for the "free exchange of ideas and information" to the socialist countries.

The authors of these demands have clearly got the wrong address. The Soviet state has always viewed the exchange of information and of artistic and intellectual treasures, the mutual spiritual enrichment of nations, and live contacts between peoples as an important component of the

policy of peaceful coexistence and as a necessary condition for the establishment of good-neighbourly relations between peoples. It has, therefore, always striven to increase contacts in this sphere.

As early as 30 December 1917 the Soviet Government addressed a message to the peoples and governments of the world in which it declared that it would work for both economic and cultural co-operation between peoples.

The West's attempt to organise a "cultural" blockade of Soviet Russia along with diplomatic and economic ones failed utterly. It is indicative that in the very first years following the October Revolution such world-famous cultural figures as G. B. Shaw, Romain Rolland, Theodore Dreiser, H. G. Wells, and many others should have spoken out in defence of Soviet Russia while the capitalist countries' official propaganda was involved in a large-scale campaign to slander socialism. The following years were marked by the triumph of Soviet revolutionary art abroad and by the constant growth of the USSR's foreign cultural links and of the Soviet public's international contacts.

The Soviet Union's line on expanding these links is a matter of principle and there is nothing transient about it. It is in the very nature of socialism and of its inherent high humanist ideals that our country should be ready to share the universally recognised achievements of Soviet culture and art with other peoples, while for its part enriching the spiritual life of the Soviet people with the best creations of human genius.

Much has been done in this field in recent years. The cultural agreements which have been signed between the USSR and the USA, the FRG, Great Britain, and many other Western countries cover practically every existing way and means of intellectual communication between peoples in the fields of culture, science, and education, including exchanges of performers, in groups or individually, scientists, lecturers, teachers, students, young people, sportsmen, as well as mutual aid in studying each other's

languages, the publication of literature, co-operation in the field of cinema, radio, and television, and much else besides.

The conclusion of these agreements once again demonstrated how great were the possibilities for increasing intellectual contacts between the peoples of countries with differing socio-political systems if these were based on the principles of mutual respect and profit and had the purpose of increasing mutual understanding and co-operation. The Soviet state is guided by these principles in every sphere of its co-operation with foreign countries in the matter of culture and information.

At the present time the Soviet Union is engaged in such co-operation with a total of 120 countries worldwide and with over 80 of these on the basis of intergovernmental bilateral agreements. The achievements of Soviet culture and art are displayed in more and more countries and cities with every passing year, and more and more foreigners are attending Soviet concerts, shows, and exhibitions. About 25 million people go to such events every year and dozens of millions more watch performances by Soviet artistes on television. About 200 Soviet arts collectives and troupes go on foreign tours every year.

The number of exhibitions of various kinds—fine arts, applied arts, graphics, etc.—that travel to and fro between Soviet artists and their foreign colleagues is growing constantly. Ever more students, post-graduates, and people on training courses are coming to study at universities and institutes in the Soviet Union from abroad, including from the capitalist countries.

Our means of mass information inform the foreign public about the life of the peoples of the USSR and about our country's internal and foreign policies. In fact, such periodicals as *The Soviet Union*, *New Times*, *Moscow News*, *Soviet Woman*, and others come out regularly in a total of more than 1.5 million copies in many foreign languages. The Novosti Press Agency has bureaus and offices in many countries worldwide and publishes dozens of

journals, newspapers, and news bulletins, as well as millions of copies of books and pamphlets in over 50 foreign languages. The Soviet radio also broadcasts in dozens of foreign languages.

Publishing foreign literature is one of the most efficient ways of enriching people and exchanging information. It is hardly likely that any country can compete with the Soviet Union in this respect. Not for nothing are we called "the most reading nation in the world". As far back as 1920 H. G. Wells wrote in his *Russia in the Shadows*: "In this strange Russia of conflict, cold, famine and pitiful privations there is actually going on now a literary task that would be inconceivable in the rich England and the rich America of today. . . . In starving Russia hundreds of people are working upon translations, and the books they translate are being set up and printed, work which may presently give a new Russia such a knowledge of world thought as no other people will possess."*

Authors from more than 100 countries have been published here since Soviet power was established. According to UNESCO figures, the USSR publishes nine times as many translations as Britain and four times as many as the USA. In the years of Soviet power American novels have been published here in 55 languages of the peoples of the USSR in about 160 million copies. Data available in the USSR show that in that period 6,305 books by American authors have been translated and published here. Here is yet another example: what other country can boast of the publication of a 200-volume Library of World Literature, 137 volumes of which include translations of foreign authors? The Writers' Union of the USSR special monthly journal *Inostrannaya literatura* (Foreign Literature) comes out in over 600,000 copies and is wholly devoted to the publication of new foreign works. A new concrete step by the Soviet Government towards con-

* H. G. Wells, *Russia in the Shadows*, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1920, pp. 47-48.

solidating international co-operation and further developing cultural contacts was taken when the USSR joined the Geneva Universal Copyright Convention in May 1973.

At one of the sittings in Belgrade the author, in fact, spoke about exchanges of books and the publication of foreign literature. I adduced a large number of facts and figures proving that the Soviet Union led in this field and showed the participants a new book that had just come out in Moscow—the three-volume collection *The Poetry of Europe*. This book contains writings by over five hundred modern poets, including, of course, by Russian and Soviet poets. Furthermore, each work is published in its original language and in Russian. The book was passed along from hand to hand and greatly impressed the delegates at the Belgrade meeting who found in the volumes the names of dozens of their own poets. They officially congratulated the Soviet Union on having taken such a unique initiative. They were no less struck when they were told that the total edition size of the 200-volume Library of World Literature that is published in the USSR now amounts to 60 million copies. This with exceptional clarity testifies to the immense efforts made by the Soviet state to acquaint its people with world literature.

Those people in the West who in recent years (and especially in connection with the results of the European Conference) have been raising a hue and cry about the "ignorance" of the citizens of the socialist countries received a cold and sobering shower when the conclusions of an international seminar on questions of information held in Finland were made public. Its main conclusion was the following: that the flow of information between West and East is unequal, since the socialist countries import from the capitalist ones many times more information in the most varied forms than do the capitalist countries from the socialist ones. In particular, it was mentioned at the seminar that in the socialist countries television programmes emanating from the West constituted 10 per

cent of all broadcasts, while television programmes from the socialist countries made up only 2 per cent of programmes in the West.

One other fact should also be mentioned and that is the colossal difference between the scale on which foreign languages are taught in the USSR (in the first place, English, German, and French are studied by 25 million Soviet people) and that on which Russian is taught in the Western countries.

Being acquainted with foreign literature and art and a general rise in cultural level and political knowledge are, naturally, increasing the interest of Soviet people in the lives of other nations and also their desire for personal contacts. Steadily increasing tourist contacts and exchanges between public, professional, and youth organisations will satisfy these interests.

The bourgeois propaganda myth that socialist society is a "closed" one and that the socialist countries do not want to communicate with other nations or to develop contacts between people is convincingly exposed by the following figures: in 1975 alone the CMEA countries received over 58 million tourists from abroad, while 35 million citizens of the socialist countries themselves traveled abroad.

It is sometimes deliberately forgotten in the West that none other than the socialist countries' public opinion initiated the calling of the largest ever meetings of fighters for peace, international youth festivals, and of various congresses and forums in which many hundreds of thousands of people from practically every state on our planet took part. It should be recalled that over 200,000 foreign delegates came to the Prague, Budapest, Berlin, Bucharest, Warsaw, Moscow, and Sofia World Festivals of Youth and Students where they met millions of young men and women from the socialist countries. (Meanwhile, the governments of most Western countries have, as is well known, forbidden their youth organisations to hold these festivals on their territories.)

The Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries conducts a great deal of work in bringing nations closer together and in exchanging delegations according to the principles of peace and humanism. It maintains contacts at present with 7,500 organisations in 134 countries worldwide, as well as with many international organisations. The Union's main partners are, of course, the foreign Societies for Friendship with the USSR: at present these number 109 and they are to be found on every continent. The Union's activities inside the Soviet Union have grown to truly nationwide scale: its 835 branches have 50 million individual and 25,000 collective members.

The Soviet Peace Committee, the USSR Committee of Youth Organisations, the Soviet Women's Committee, the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, and other mass public organisations in the USSR all engage in their activities in the same spirit. Similar organisations are active in all the other socialist countries.

It is indicative (and the author personally experienced this when taking part in international meetings of journalists) that the Western supporters of the "free exchange of ideas and information" as a rule avoid talking about exchanges of cultural artefacts, works of art, scientific papers, and literature (their position in this matter is clearly unfavourable when compared to the socialist countries) and try to reduce subject to a demand for the "free distribution" of Western newspapers and magazines in the socialist countries. What can be said on this matter?

Firstly, that the responsible organisations in both the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries do buy and distribute a certain quantity of foreign periodicals, part being put on sale to the public and part going to libraries and reading rooms. Nothing need be said here about, say, foreign scientific and technological journals; these are bought in large quantities by the socialist countries and are very popular with our scientific and technological intelligentsia and students. All in all, the socialist countries

import considerably more Western newspapers and magazines than the Western countries do periodicals from the socialist countries.

Secondly, when considering the matter of the "free distribution" of Western publications it is necessary to bear in mind that many of these cannot be distributed in the socialist countries, because they preach "ideas" that contravene these countries' laws, that are alien or even hostile to their socio-political systems and their morals.

"For example," said Leonid Brezhnev at the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, "we have a law banning the propaganda of war in any form. There is legislation prohibiting the dissemination of the ideas of racial or national strife and hatred, and of ideas which degrade the national dignity of any people. There are laws to prevent immoral behaviour, laws against the moral corruption of society. Are we expected, perhaps, to repudiate these laws in the name of free exchange of ideas and information? Or are we to be persuaded that this would serve the cause of detente and closer international ties?"* The Soviet people will never betray either its socio-political achievements or its Soviet way of life and communist world outlook. In the same way the Soviet state will never allow anyone to interfere in its internal affairs, to preach views hostile to socialism, or to force bourgeois ideology and morals down its throat.

Incidentally, the bourgeois propaganda thesis according to which the distribution of information in the West is supposedly absolutely free and subject to no restrictions is far from reflecting the true state of affairs there. It is actually even contradicted by those same Western countries' laws. In Britain, for example, one can be imprisoned for incitement against the crown, the government, Parliament, or the legal system and for inciting feelings of hatred and hostility between the various classes of the country's citizens; Italy's criminal code provides for up to

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 324.

five years' imprisonment for false, exaggerating or tendentious reporting on the state's internal affairs; the FRG's criminal code recommends up to three years' imprisonment for disseminating, possessing, or importing propaganda for forbidden parties and also propaganda material produced by foreign governments or organisations that would promote the aims of these parties....

When these and other similar laws that exist in the Western countries were referred to at the corresponding commissions at the second stage of the European Conference in Geneva, this made quite an impression. . . .

And here is another illuminating fact about how the USA "encourages" the exchange of information with the socialist countries. During an investigation into CIA activities, it came out that America's intelligence service for many years very strictly controlled all the mail coming from the USSR, including both printed matter and letters. For example, in New York alone the envelopes of 2.7 million letters were photographed and hundreds of thousands of letters were furthermore opened and also photographed.

In rejecting the concept of an unrestricted "flow of information and ideas" as a poorly disguised attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of other peoples by spreading bourgeois propaganda in their countries, the socialist countries, at the same time, believe that international co-operation in the field of information that would be in the interests of peace and mutual understanding and the cultural and scientific and technological progress of all peoples is both possible and desirable. The many intergovernmental agreements on cultural co-operation concluded between the Soviet Union and capitalist countries contain special articles concerning the exchange of information on the basis of mutual respect and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

The socialist countries' constructive position is further testified to by the fact that a far-ranging programme for the international exchange of information, including the wider distribution of foreign newspapers and other pe-

riodical publications, the exchange of radio and television programmes, an increase in book exchanges, and other matters was worked out at the European Conference. Measures to improve the working conditions of foreign journalists, who because of their profession are able to exert considerable influence on public opinion in their countries, and to increase contacts between journalists were also outlined. The Final Act of the European Conference in Helsinki provides for the promotion of film festivals, book fairs, meetings between the countries' public at large and their young people, and so on.

It can be seen today that the implementation of the concrete accords contained in the Final Act has already led to several positive results (more information is distributed in the countries that took part in the European Conference, information institutions and organs are co-operating more, quite a few new agreements have been signed on these questions, foreign journalists' working conditions have been made easier, correspondents permanently accredited in foreign capitals are given multiple entry-exit visas, a number of meetings of European journalists have been held, and so on) although, frankly speaking, the volume of positive points could have been greater if the West had carried out the course towards detente and co-operation agreed upon in Helsinki more consistently.

If the Helsinki accords are implemented honestly and in a spirit of co-operation and mutual respect, exchanging information will help create a new political climate in Europe, will help the process of detente to go further and grow stronger, and will promote the spiritual enrichment of the European peoples.

In order for all this to become a reality, however, the West still has to abandon the philosophy and practices of "cold" and "psychological" warfare in this field.

That the West's immense machine for "psychological" warfare against socialism is continuing to operate is a fact that should not be forgotten. Its main centres—Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe which were set up by in-

telligence services in the worst years of the cold war—continue daily and even hourly to pollute the ether with anti-communist propaganda. The Western countries' governments maintain a whole network of institutions that engage in foreign political propaganda, most of it against the socialist countries. It has been calculated that the expenditure on foreign political propaganda by government services alone amounts to about 500 million dollars a year in the USA, 125 million dollars in the FRG, and up to 100 million dollars in Britain. Tens of thousands of specialists in subversive operations are engaged in these activities which are carefully co-ordinated on the international plane by NATO.

It should also be added that all sorts of émigré and anti-communist organisations have entrenched themselves in the West and that these not only engage actively in propaganda work against the socialist countries, but even go so far as to carry out provocations against their embassies and citizens and to smuggle anti-communist literature and anti-Soviet leaflets.

And here I would like to ask those who are hysterically calling on the socialist countries to open their frontiers to an unrestricted flow of "ideas and information" from the West whether they consider "psychological warfare", subversive propaganda, falsifications, and slander to be compatible with true peaceful coexistence? And are they not muddling the exchange of ideas and information with the legalisation of "psychological warfare"?

The socialist countries sincerely welcome the exchange of ideas of peace, of friendship, and of national and social progress and their doors are wide open for the holding of international forums under these noble slogans. The "ideas" of anti-communism and hostility between peoples, of racism and chauvinism, of militarism and Zionism, of spiritual degradation just cannot gain currency in socialist society.

The Soviet Union now as always is in favour of expanding this co-operation, of wide-ranging contacts be-

tween people of various countries, of meetings between young people and the representatives of related professions, and of increasing the two-way flow of tourists—but on condition that all this is done while respecting the sovereignty, laws, and customs of each country and that it serves the mutual spiritual enrichment of nations, the growth of trust between them, and the strengthening of the ideals of peace and good-neighbourliness.

The Struggle for the Minds and Souls of the Young

No matter what concrete problems are at the centre of the ideological struggle—be they the principles of peaceful coexistence, the consequences of the scientific and technological revolution, or the defence of human rights—Western propaganda always gives a most prominent place to the one main question: to which system—socialism or capitalism—does the future belong? It is no coincidence that in recent times ideological arguments have come to be more and more entwined with futurology and social prognostication, that a “Year 2000 Commission” is being set up in the West, and that ever more books and films are coming out in which attempts are made to peek into the “mysterious 21st century”.

Meanwhile, there is very little time to go before it will be upon us. In the year 2000 the boys and girls who were born in 1978 will be young specialists just beginning their working lives. Before then, however, they will go through schools and higher educational institutions and absorb one world view or another—that is to say, they will be moulded ideologically.

The West’s ruling class understands full well that the fate of the capitalist system which is now abandoning its positions as socialism advances depends precisely on these young people, on how new generations are brought up.

One Western author openly recognises that the decisive battle from the point of view of the prospects for bourgeois society will take place on the battlefield which we call "the young".

It is onto this "battlefield" that the West's ruling circles have brought their whole vast ideological arsenal to bear. They are aiming simultaneously at several different things: at the young generation in their own countries—since it, naturally, causes them the most concern, and at the young in other countries, including the socialist ones—since imperialism still hopes to convert them to the bourgeois faith. Special recipes and tactics have been worked out for each of these categories of young people.

* * *

Any Soviet person who has happened to meet and talk with young men and women from the capitalist countries was surely struck by one fact above all: the extraordinary monotony of their questions about the USSR, demonstrating a most primitive knowledge or even total ignorance of the Soviet Union's life. What is the explanation for this in our age of abundant information, increasing literacy, and growing contacts between nations?

On the example of the United States, let us look at the sources from which the American child and later school-boy obtains his information about the Soviet Union, socialism, and international relations. (We will only examine these questions since they are the most pertinent to the subject of this book.) From the very first, the child is "glued" to the television. There are special programmes for him and he soon comes to have his favourite heroes. His beloved cartoon cats and mice are gradually replaced by a wonderfully tough man who can handle any enemy. This is not yet the famous "007", but a simplified cowboy variant of him. The young child, however, watches the television in a trance, a toy pistol held tight in his fist. A few years later his parents will be unable to tear

him away from the set by any means when the invincible James Bond is shooting it out gracefully and with never a miss.

Who are James Bond and dozens of other television serial "heroes" like him shooting at, watched by millions of young viewers? As a rule at "communist agents" presented as cruel, crafty, and at the final count stupid. That is how the first propaganda stereotype "The Russians are bad" is implanted in the child's brain.

Or take America's famous comics, both in newspapers and in the form of separate magazines. Their heroes are frequently also "supermen" or FBI agents who do away with Communists, agents, "coloured", and so on. Millions of American children are addicted to this trash and it has a great effect on them!

The further you look, the worse it gets. The young American gets a real "brainwashing" in school. The secondary schools of many states have "courses on communism" which would be better called "courses on anti-communism", because the schoolchildren have nothing but anti-Soviet propaganda drummed into their heads. Numerous textbooks with similar ideas have been published along with "visual aids", and so on. All this is combined with the exceptionally low quality of the teaching in American schools of anything to do with the Soviet Union, be it geography, history, or any other subject.

During one of my trips around the USA with a Soviet delegation, we visited a class-room which had a large wall map of the world on which the territory of the USSR was marked as the "Russian Empire". Oh well, we thought, it's probably a very old map. We then asked the schoolchildren what the name of our country was now. Not one of them knew the answer.

Or take another example. A mass poll of American schoolchildren produced the following "information" about the Soviet Union: Russia is about as large as New York or, perhaps, a little bigger.... The capital of Russia is Cuba.

It should be kept in mind that young Americans are taught to hate communism at a time when all sorts of other traits of the "American way of life" such as the cult of violence, rising crime, and consumer psychology are working on them. American television is exerting an extremely pernicious influence on the young. For example, 161 murders, two suicides, 192 assaults, 24 attempted murders, 83 robberies, 15 kidnappings, seven attempted lynchings, 21 prison escapes, six bomb explosions, 11 cases of extortion, and two poisonings were shown in a single week on Los Angeles television.

The generation of young Americans which was brought up in the way described above was the one which later bombed Vietnamese villages and shot unarmed civilians before the conscience in some of them awoke. We might at this point cite a few figures showing what the Vietnam war did to the American soldiers who went through it. A total of 2,400,000 Americans took part in the "Vietnam campaign", in the main, of course, young people. Of these 800,000 were put into hospital on their return because of wounds or psychological disturbances, including 200,000 (!) who attempted to commit suicide. Fifty thousand Vietnam veterans now get pensions from the state for psychological disturbances. Twenty-six per cent of veterans have become drug addicts, and so on.

I am not, of course, saying that all young Americans who have been put through the propaganda mill and the brainwashing become incorrigibly aggressive or are imbued with the philosophy of "American superiority", and of hatred of the ideals of peace and progress. It is well known that that same generation of Americans developed during the Vietnam war a strong peace movement, that the so-called New Left whose platform was sharply critical of bourgeois society's ways emerged and that interest in socialism began to grow then. It is a fact, however, that reactionary forces and ultra-right organisations have also recently begun to join the brainwashing campaign. The John Birch Society, the Christian Anti-Comm-

nist Crusade, the Ku Klux Klan, the American Nazi Party, and other similar organisations possess a vast propaganda apparatus, produce hundreds of publications, and own subversive radio stations. And all this is in the main aimed at young people.

A new "vogue for fascism" is being rapidly promoted among the young in many countries and particularly in the FRG, where it is called the "Hitler-Welle" (the Hitler wave). Dozens of publishing houses are putting out biographies of and monographs on the *Führer*.

One last example for all its unlikelihood and geographical distance from the above ones illustrates the same thesis that the mental training of the young in the spirit of revanchism, militarism, and of the rehabilitation of war criminals is growing to dangerous proportions: the 1974 capitulation of the last Japanese samurai, a story that made a lot of noise at the time.

Everyone knows that the Second World War came to end on 2 September 1945 with the signing by Japan of the Act of Capitulation on board the battleship *Missouri*. For Sublieutenant Hiroo Onoda of the Japanese Imperial Army, however, the war ended much later, on 10 March 1974, to be precise, when he surrendered his sword to President Marcos of the Philippines. Thirty years earlier, in the autumn of 1944, the sublieutenant had landed at the head of a special operations group on Lubang Island where it was to cause a diversion and scout. The war finished soon afterwards, but Onoda's detachment continued to fight: over the long years he added hundreds of killed and wounded Filipinos to his "score" and committed arson, robberies, and acts of violence. He and the men under his command knew that Japan had capitulated. Japan sent envoys to the island and they used loudspeakers and leaflets to call on the samurais hiding in the jungle to surrender and return home. One after the other Onoda's men died or deserted, but he himself went on fighting alone. This continued until the sublieutenant's former commander flew to the island and personally can-

celled his order of thirty years before. Only then did Onoda surrender his sword and return to Japan.

Two things are striking about this story. The first is the strength of the reactionary samurai ideology which forced the young man to continue fighting into his old age, to all intents and purposes alone, against people and good sense. And the second is the welcome Onoda was given on his return to Japan: the shouts of "*banzai!*" and the crowd of thousands at the airport, the great fuss made in the press and on television over the new "national hero", the pointed remarks addressed to the young—see what a real patriot and soldier should be like! And so in the country on which the atomic bomb was dropped, propaganda made a war criminal who killed people for many years in peacetime into a hero to be imitated by the young.

It might be asked what connection all this has with the problems of peaceful coexistence. In my opinion, the connection is a direct one. Wars are hatched in the minds of men, states the UN Charter. And all that I have described above—the anti-communist propaganda, the violence, fascism, the rehabilitation of war criminals—is, to call things by their real names, an attempt by the forces of reaction to prepare the minds of the young for war. Furthermore, this is a massive and well-planned attempt and it represents a danger to peaceful coexistence and co-operation between states. That the young generation is being brought up in this spirit is due to the persistence of the ideas of the "cold" and "psychological" warfare.

The young in the capitalist countries are the main, but not the only target of bourgeois ideology and propaganda. The West's ruling class is making great efforts to influence the minds of the young all over the planet, including in the developing and socialist countries.

Large forces and an immense ideological and propaganda apparatus have been thrown into this battle. Its main features are, firstly, praising the capitalist system to the skies as an example to all developing countries and, secondly, falsifying the theory and practice of socialism

in an attempt to prove that it would be "wrong" and "unsuitable" for Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

For understandable reasons bourgeois propaganda does not have as easy an access to the population of the socialist world as it does to those of the capitalist and developing countries. This does not mean, however, that the West has abandoned its attempts to bring about a restoration of the capitalist system in the socialist states. On the contrary, the whole strategy of anti-communism under the peaceful coexistence of the two systems is being built on attempts to "erode" socialism and to bring about its "transformation" by means of ideological sabotage.

A special place is given to the young in the socialist countries, because they are considered to be the "least resistant", to have still not developed an "ideological immunity" to bourgeois propaganda. Such typical traits of the young as their curiosity, their critical attitude to reality (the so-called youthful maximalism), and the attraction they feel for "forbidden fruit" are all taken into account. The corresponding bent is, therefore, given to the structure and contents of the radio broadcasts to the socialist countries—the West's main propaganda channel—and special programmes for young people are elaborated.

Putting aside all secondary matters, the main aim of all this Western radio propaganda to the socialist countries can be defined as an attempt to subvert socialist society's ideological and moral-political unity and to sow doubts, especially among the young, as to the correctness of the internal and foreign policies of their governing Communist parties. This line is carefully elaborated and co-ordinated between all the imperialist "psychological warfare" centres. As the Polish intelligence agent Andrzej Czechowicz testified, a meeting was held during the time he was with Radio Free Europe between representatives of the subversive radio stations, of the corresponding departments of NATO, and of the institutes of "Sovietology" specially on the question of what line should be taken in

broadcasting propaganda to the young in the socialist countries.

In placing its hopes for socialism's transformation into a bourgeois system on the current young generation of Soviet people, imperialist propaganda is merely presenting its wishes as reality. The West's "specialists" have never been able to understand why young men fought in the ranks of the First Cavalry Army during the Civil War, why young Soviet soldiers marched off to their deaths during the Great Patriotic War, and why millions of members of the Komsomol left their home towns to develop the bleak virgin lands or to build the Bratsk Hydroelectric Power Station in the taiga. The imperialist strategists also placed their hopes on those generations, but they have, evidently, learnt little from history. In exactly the same way they today fail to understand the forces that move and drive young Soviet people in the 1970s as they continue in their fathers' footsteps, going off at the Party's and the Komsomol's call to build the Baikal-Amur Railway, to the Non-Black-Earth regions, to the harsh North, and to the baking-hot steppes of Central Asia. The years pass: several generations of Soviet people have already lived under socialism and are successfully building communism, but the West still goes on nursing its "hopes".

Ideas can only be disarmed by other ideas. Even the most powerful radio stations and the most subtle propaganda methods cannot compensate for the spiritual impotence of contemporary capitalist society, for its inability to put forward social and political slogans capable of attracting the broad masses of workers and the young. Some of the West's more sober-minded propagandists have even been obliged to recognise this.

* * *

It is said that some scientists deciphering the text of an ancient Egyptian papyrus found a statement by the Pharaoh that "the young are not what they used to be".

When all is said and done, there can hardly have ever been a young generation throughout mankind's history that has not had to listen to such reproaches from its elders.

There is something natural about this. Every father, in fact, wants his son to continue in his footsteps, to share his ideals, or simply to copy him. Every new generation, however, grows up and is moulded under new conditions and even if it preserves the continuity of the main things—ideology and the desire to work for society's good—it will inevitably differ in some way or other from the generation which brought it forth.

In socialist society a new type of generation and a new kind of continuity from one to the other are taking shape under the influence of such factors as the liquidation of the exploitation of man by man, public ownership of property, the unity of the workers', peasants', and intelligentsia's interests, their socio-political and ideological unity, and the close friendship between peoples. The features formed under the influence of these factors are permanent and are passed on from one generation to another. All this together excludes the possibility of a "generation gap" under socialism and this conclusion is convincingly confirmed by the whole history of the Soviet state.

In bourgeois society the natural differences between the generations are aggravated to the level of collision under the influence of social conflicts, the heat of the class struggle, and the general socio-political and spiritual crisis of capitalism. It is clear to every Marxist that social conflicts are not due to age, but to class differences, yet the bourgeoisie and its propaganda find it more profitable to speak of "generation gaps" than to recognise that the class struggle is growing sharper.

It is now recognised in the West that "something has gone wrong" with the young in capitalist society; to keep this hidden is no longer possible. Without looking too deeply into the history of this matter, it need simply be said that each new generation in the last thirty years has been accused by Western propaganda of some sins or

other and been given a corresponding label (the "lost generation", the "silent generation", and so on).

The new generation that appeared sometime in the mid-1960s was called the politicised generation by many in the West. The pendulum which had been pulled too far to one side for too long suddenly swung hard in the opposite direction. The aggression in Vietnam and capitalism's social conflicts and spiritual crisis drove the young out into the streets with protest banners in their hands. Mass demonstrations of young people and students took place in France, the USA, Italy, the FRG, Japan, Mexico, and other countries in 1967-1968. The young occupied their universities, built barricades, and clashed with police forces and troops. The student troubles in Italy paralysed the majority of the country's universities for three months. The USA saw its first general strike of students—against the war in Vietnam. The shock waves of the events of May 1968 in France in which tens of thousands of students took part were felt throughout the world. According to UN figures, 48 capitalist countries saw demonstrations by young people in 1971. The number of young strikers in the West increased by nearly three and a half times between 1966 and 1972.

And now we are in the late 1970s. What are the West's young people like today? They present a variety, as usual. One section has taken over the consumer psychology of its elders and its ideals are limited to owning a car and a cottage. This lot enjoy the support of bourgeois society and propaganda.

Another quite large section is putting its energy into various laughable activities that are claimed to be "protests" against capitalist society. Incidentally, it is about these people that the bourgeois press writes at length and with great pleasure, labelling practically the whole current young generation as one of wastrels.

Specialists on the young—and there are a goodly number of these around nowadays—note with amazement that despite the "sexual revolution" and the general decline

in moral standards, the West's young people today still have strong "old-fashioned" sentiments and pure feelings. I caught sight once in a Western newspaper's "In Brief" column that letters addressed to Juliet, the heroine of Shakespeare's tragedy, to this day still get posted to Verona. Their authors are for the most part young girls in the throes of their first love who turn to Juliet for advice on how to "enchant" their Romeos. Let us not accuse these letter-writers of naivety: they would simply like Juliet to be their contemporary. What amazes one is something else—that neither the soullessness of "industrial society" nor the propaganda made for amorality can extirpate the admiration that today's young people still have for the fine feelings so wonderfully described by Shakespeare nearly four centuries ago.

All this, nevertheless, still fails to paint a complete picture of the West's young in the 1970s, since all these characteristics were to be found in a greater or lesser degree in the generations that came before them. The main trait that distinguishes them is, of course, their evident politicisation, their growing interest and activities in society's socio-economic life. Here are a few examples. The congress of the youth wing of the FRG's ruling Social Democratic Party put forward a demand that structural reforms of an anti-capitalist nature be carried out in the country, that key industrial branches and banks be nationalised, and that the policy of detente and of developing relations with the socialist countries continue. The young in the FRG organised a large political demonstration: about 40,000 students and schoolchildren marched on Bonn carrying banners with slogans such as "Stop Spending on Weapons—Spend on Education!", "More University Places for Workers' Children!", and so on. The country's youth organisations collected over 500,000 signatures to a demand that a stop be put to discrimination for one's political views. And what demonstrations of solidarity with the Chilean patriots there were all over the world after the fascist coup in that country! Even in traditionally neutral

and calm Switzerland thousands of young people burst onto the territory of the United Nations Office in Geneva demanding that the fascist butchers raising terror in far-off Santiago be stopped.

Another sign of this politicisation is the young generation's striving for revolutionary changes. A large poll of nearly 4,000 male and female students in the FRG a couple of years ago showed that the majority of those questioned were in favour of changes in the social system, while 10 per cent openly preferred a revolutionary overhaul of the country.

The prestige of Marxist-Leninist ideology is growing in the eyes of the young abroad. After long years of persecution and of having to exist to all intents and purposes as an underground party, America's Communists are now finding it possible to speak openly to audiences of many thousands of young people in universities all over the United States. Under pressure from the progressive public, the USA has been obliged to abolish the notorious McCarran Act (the Subversive Activities Control Act) under which "subversive organisations"—and the authorities included a vast number of progressive American youth organisations as such—were obliged to register themselves.

To the surprise and disappointment of the ruling circles, ever more young men and women in the West are rejecting the bourgeois "philosophy of comfort" which their propaganda tried so hard to inject into them. In some, it is true, this has taken an extreme "ultra-left" form, but this is also an index of the mood of a certain section of the young.

It is difficult to paint a complete picture of the whole young generation of today in a brief essay. A "group portrait" ought to include the young people of the socialist countries who are living interesting and full lives and are building communist society. It ought also to include the young generation in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that is actively laying the foundations of their countries' in-

dependence or engaging in armed struggle against the last remains of colonialism. It ought to include the numerous national and international progressive youth and student organisations that are mobilising millions of young men and women all over our planet to fight for their rights, for democracy, and for peace.

Looking attentively at such a portrait of a generation, one cannot but feel a surge of optimism and faith in the future of mankind.

CONCLUSION

This is not the first time that I have written about modern politics and each time I have come up against the same difficulty: international life develops and advances far more rapidly than does the traditionally slow editing and publishing process. While this book was being translated and typeset, one event after another took place to confirm the correctness and topicality of my chosen theme.

The new Constitution of the USSR, a constitution without historical precedents that promulgates and guarantees the very widest complex of human rights and gives force of law to the Soviet state's policy of peace and friendship between nations, was passed. Never before in the history of mankind has there been such a constitution; one hundred and forty million citizens were involved in discussing it and in the practical work on its passage.

The 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution was celebrated far and wide throughout the world. The figures quoted in the report "The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress" on the might of the Soviet economy, the upsurge of culture, the blooming of democracy and the repeated undertaking with the whole of mankind as witness to contribute in every possible way to the cause of ensuring a lasting peace on earth all went to increase the strength of the peace forces and to activate the struggle for security and friendship among nations.

Important results in the development of this line were achieved in the foreign political field. In the autumn of 1977 the Soviet Union placed before the UN a draft Declaration on the Deepening and Strengthening of Detente and this question occupied the central place in the work

of the 32nd General Assembly. This was after a document on this question—the Joint Statement of the USSR and France on Relaxation of International Tension—had been signed in Rambouillet by Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Leonid Brezhnev and French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing.

In early 1978 Leonid Brezhnev visited the FRG. Extremely important agreements were reached there and a number of long-term documents signed.

The joint Soviet-West German declaration states in particular: "From developments over the last few decades, both parties conclude that detente is essential, possible and useful. . . . They express their desire to extend and deepen the process of detente, and make it progressive and stable."

The world press focussed particular attention on the fact that, during Leonid Brezhnev's visit, an Agreement was signed on developing long-term co-operation between the USSR and the FRG in the sphere of the economy and industry for the next 25 years. The right conclusion was drawn that the two powers were expressing their belief that the policy of detente and co-operation would continue right into the next century.

Other important meetings are still to come and these will typify international life. Political detente is an on-going process.

Although detente is undoubtedly the predominant trend in international relations, over last few years it develops unevenly, with ups and downs. During 1977-78, for instance, a policy of cancelling detente and complicating relations with the Soviet Union began to gain the upper hand in Washington in order to speed up the arms race to the benefit of the military-industrial complex. This threatened to nullify everything that was achieved in the early 70s.

At this important time, the Soviet Union was firm in supporting detente and ignored the provocations of those seeking to break off this process. The *Pravda* editorial of June 17, 1978 "On the Present Policy of the US Govern-

ment", which met with a broad international response, discussed the Soviet foreign policy line, stating, in particular: "We do not accept the invitations to attend the funeral of detente and the hopes of millions of people for a peaceful future. . . . Detente and the struggle for peace and disarmament have proved their tremendous vitality and are given the widest support by all nations. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are fully resolved to wage a consistent and staunch battle in all fields, especially in that of limiting and cutting armaments."

The Soviet Union's practical activities confirm its loyalty to the policy of detente. During 1978, the country firmly rebuffed imperialist attempts at massive intervention in the internal affairs of the socialist states and the provocative fanning of a scandal over "Soviet-Cuban intervention" in Africa (NATO was meanwhile organising punitive operations in Zaire); at the same time the Soviet Union put forward comprehensive proposals at the UN General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament and, together with its allies, took a position at the Vienna talks on cutting armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, etc. that complied with the wishes of the Western side. It was mainly due to this principled and consistent policy, that the political course called detente was maintained.

No minor role was played in this by Western Europe's especial interest in the continuation of this course. During the alarming period of 1977-78 the leaders of the European capitalist countries as a whole supported Moscow's policy of deepening detente, rather than Washington's line of a return to confrontation. This is what is shown by the bilateral documents the USSR signed with France, West Germany, Denmark, Turkey, Austria and other states over this period: each of the documents stressed fidelity to the policy of detente and stated that no reasonable alternative existed to this.

Other decisive factors are the movement of the world public for peace, the interest of Western business circles

in trading with the socialist countries, and so on. Taken together, these factors made it possible to maintain detente as the predominant trend in international relations.

The arms race, however, is continuing, as I have shown above, at no lesser a rate and that means, of course, that there is still a danger of war. Both the blessings of detente and the danger of war concern every inhabitant of our planet.

Well, the main aim of this book was to prove—and the author hopes that he has done so—that in the most important question of the present day, the question of war and peace, no one can be neutral. No one. Because this directly touches on the vital interests of every human being on this planet.

It might be asked whether this needs proving at all. After all, the popular movement for peace has grown to a tremendous size and millions of people are now involved in it. And it is true that the peace movement has a long history and that it has become much more active in recent years. There have been such massive and authoritative forums as the October 1973 World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, the largest ever meeting of fighters for peace—3,500 delegates from 143 countries representing over 1,000 national and 120 international organisations were present. The Tenth World Festival of Youth and Students was also held that year in Berlin.

There have been assemblies of the peace-loving public of Europe and a congress of women for peace. A World Conference to End the Arms Race, for Disarmament and Detente was held in Helsinki in 1976. The representatives of 115 countries came together at the January 1977 World Congress of Peace Forces. Finally, perhaps the most telling index of the peace-loving public's activities is the fact that over 500 million signatures were collected for the new Stockholm Appeal against the arms race and for disarmament.

All this cannot but make one optimistic. I have also tried in this book, however, to show that there remain

large forces that are against peace, disarmament, and detente. They do not collect signatures in support of war-like policies, but they are continuing to engage in practical preparations for war, stockpiling Everests of weapons, spreading militarist propaganda, and ideologically brainwashing the masses. It would be an unforgivable mistake to believe that the danger of a new world war is an illusion or that it has been pushed into the background or even further away.

No, the task of putting a stop to preparations for war is now more urgent than ever before. "The main thing today," General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev emphasised in his greeting to the participants in the 1977 World Forum of Peace Forces, "is to act, to find rational solutions that would lead as rapidly as possible, without procrastination, to real disarmament, to the materialisation of detente and its transformation into a universal and irreversible process." Much can be done in this by political parties, trade unions, women's and youth organisations, parliamentarians, scientific and cultural workers, and by all peace-loving forces taking an active part in the struggle to prevent the outbreak of a new world conflict. It can without fear of exaggeration be said that right now, given today's balance of power in the world arena, there are new and ever better prospects for their activities and for each person who knows the value of peace to speak out. But we must act now—today!

The Soviet Union, which celebrated the 61st anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, has proved by its whole history that the struggle for peace was and remains the main aim of its foreign policies. It will use all its authority and make every effort to achieve peace. And we Soviet people are sure that peace will be defended through the joint efforts of the socialist countries and of the peace-loving forces on every continent and that we will be able at last to draw a line under the already too long list of the wars mankind has been through.

But we must act now—today!

Request to Readers

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubov-sky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

